

SENATE.

TUESDAY, May 15, 1900.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. McCOMAS, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Journal will stand approved, without objection.

INQUIRIES RELATIVE TO THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate of the United States:

In further response to the resolution of the Senate of January 17, 1900, and having reference to my messages to the Senate of March 5, March 27, and April 18, 1900 (Senate Documents, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session, No. 208, Parts I, II, and III), I transmit herewith a copy of a letter dated March 8, 1900, from Maj. Gen. E. S. Otis, military governor of the Philippine Islands, with a copy of an autograph letter of Emilio Aguinaldo, inclosed therewith, dated Malolos, January 7, 1899, four weeks before the insurgent attack on the American forces, to Señor D. Benito Legarda, warning him and his family to leave the city of Manila.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 14, 1900.

REPORT OF THE PHILIPPINE COMMISSION.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on the Philippines, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, Volume II of the Report of the United States Commission to the Philippine Islands.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, May 14, 1900.

CHRISTIAN CHRITZMAN.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the Sergeant-at-Arms, United States Senate, transmitting a statement of the amount expended by him under authority of the resolution of February 20, 1900, in payment of the funeral expenses of Christian Chritzman; which was ordered to be printed, and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Pensions:

A bill (H. R. 538) granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Winch;

A bill (H. R. 852) granting an increase of pension to James Cooper;

A bill (H. R. 1230) granting a pension to Hannah Kennedy;

A bill (H. R. 1570) granting a pension to Susie Margarite Landrum;

A bill (H. R. 1748) granting a pension to Ellen V. McCleery;

A bill (H. R. 2020) granting a pension to Clarissa Carruth;

A bill (H. R. 2634) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus Darwin Steen;

A bill (H. R. 2694) granting a pension to Maggie D. Chapman;

A bill (H. R. 2708) granting an increase of pension to Cecelia B. Chauncey;

A bill (H. R. 2726) granting a pension to James A. Root;

A bill (H. R. 3082) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Sparks;

A bill (H. R. 3252) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Somerville Lion;

A bill (H. R. 3495) granting an increase of pension to Levi G. Wilgus;

A bill (H. R. 3526) granting a pension to James M. Ellett;

A bill (H. R. 4424) granting a pension to Isaac N. Jennings;

A bill (H. R. 4455) granting a pension to Louisa Weidner;

A bill (H. R. 4554) granting an increase of pension to Margaret M. Badger;

A bill (H. R. 4571) granting an increase of pension to Helen Mauck;

A bill (H. R. 4649) granting a pension to William Bates;

A bill (H. R. 4992) granting an increase of pension to Susan Buntin;

A bill (H. R. 5192) granting a pension to Louise Adams;

A bill (H. R. 5330) granting an increase of pension to Uri S. Keith;

A bill (H. R. 5439) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Holland;

A bill (H. R. 5549) granting an increase of pension to David H. Ingerson;

A bill (H. R. 5555) granting a pension to Virginia Hull;

A bill (H. R. 5647) granting a pension to Amanda Hurd;

A bill (H. R. 5673) granting an increase of pension to Ellen A. Spalding;

A bill (H. R. 5695) granting a pension to Matilda Reeves;
A bill (H. R. 5720) granting a pension to David Smith;
A bill (H. R. 5929) granting an increase of pension to Barton Acuff;

A bill (H. R. 6151) granting a pension to Zylpha J. Kelly;

A bill (H. R. 6164) granting a pension to Julia Traynor;

A bill (H. R. 6352) granting a pension to Lizzie B. Leitch;

A bill (H. R. 6425) granting an increase of pension to William H. Wendell;

A bill (H. R. 6490) granting a pension to Martha E. Horn;

A bill (H. R. 6559) granting an increase of pension to Genevieve Loughton;

A bill (H. R. 6564) granting a pension to Anna M. Starr;

A bill (H. R. 6990) granting a pension to Patrick O'Donnell;

A bill (H. R. 7145) granting a pension to Catharine Slayton;

A bill (H. R. 7180) granting an increase of pension to Amelia A. Taylor;

A bill (H. R. 7588) granting a pension to Robert Patterson;

A bill (H. R. 7812) granting a pension to Lydia Strang;

A bill (H. R. 7852) granting an increase of pension to Oliver M. Brown;

A bill (H. R. 8044) granting an increase of pension to James M. Barrett;

A bill (H. R. 8157) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Mills;

A bill (H. R. 8211) granting an increase of pension to William Shulmire;

A bill (H. R. 8217) granting a pension to Josephine B. Wood;

A bill (H. R. 8235) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Metcalf;

A bill (H. R. 8236) granting an increase of pension to James M. Dennison;

A bill (H. R. 8404) granting an increase of pension to Timothy A. Lewis;

A bill (H. R. 8475) granting an increase of pension to Alice de Vecchj;

A bill (H. R. 8476) granting a pension to Christopher Costello;

A bill (H. R. 8536) granting an increase of pension to Robert Anderson, jr.;

A bill (H. R. 8686) granting a pension to James A. Tulloss;

A bill (H. R. 8829) granting an increase of pension to John P. Pepper;

A bill (H. R. 8885) granting an increase of pension to Sara H. M. Miley;

A bill (H. R. 9175) granting an increase of pension to Stella B. Armstrong;

A bill (H. R. 9194) granting a pension to Sarah Elvira C. Upham;

A bill (H. R. 9207) granting a pension to John F. Kelly;

A bill (H. R. 9424) granting an increase of pension to George Cronk;

A bill (H. R. 9481) granting an increase of pension to James Anderson;

A bill (H. R. 9701) granting a pension to Jonah Duncan;

A bill (H. R. 9740) granting a pension to Sophia A. Lane;

A bill (H. R. 9826) granting an increase of pension to Russell L. Moore;

A bill (H. R. 9915) granting a pension to Madison T. Trent;

A bill (H. R. 10060) granting an increase of pension to Winefred M. Goins;

A bill (H. R. 10071) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Clark;

A bill (H. R. 10082) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Oliver;

A bill (H. R. 10147) granting a pension to Delia A. Jones;

A bill (H. R. 10443) granting a pension to Anna C. White;

A bill (H. R. 10455) granting an increase of pension to Bertha G. Kimball;

A bill (H. R. 10581) granting a pension to Joseph B. McGahn; and

A bill (H. R. 10612) granting an increase of pension to Richard Harden.

The bill (H. R. 4063) to remove the charge of desertion against David Edwards was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 8298) to remove the charge of desertion from the record of Walter Allen, of the United States Navy, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The bill (H. R. 8815) to amend chapter 4, Title XIII of the Revised Statutes of the United States, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ELLA COTTON CONRAD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1619) granting an increase of pension to Ella Cotton Conrad.

The amendment was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "thirty-five."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate nonconcur in the

amendment made by the House of Representatives and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TURNER were appointed.

JULIA MACN. HENRY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1781) granting an increase of pension to Julia MacN. Henry.

The amendment was, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "one hundred" and insert "fifty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I make a similar motion in reference to that bill.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate; and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TURNER were appointed.

SARAH E. TRADEWELL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1890) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Tradewell.

The amendment was, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty-five" and insert "twenty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment made by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

MARGARET B. SHIPP.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1066) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Shipp.

The amendments were, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "thirty" and insert "twenty-five," and in line 9, after the word "receiving," to insert:

And \$2 per month additional on account of each of the minor children of said William E. Shipp until they reach the age of 16 years.

Mr. GALLINGER. I move concurrence in the amendments made by the House of Representatives.

The motion was agreed to.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. MASON presented the petition of A. Y. Trogdon, of Paris, Ill., praying that an examination be made into the subject of pension appeals; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. McMILLAN presented petitions of the Wesleyan Guild, Chapter of Epworth League, the Young Men's Christian Association, the Presbyterian Christian Endeavor Society, the congregation of the First Congregational Church, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Welsh Woman's Relief Corps, the Order of Lady Maccaabees, and of the congregation of the Episcopal Church, all of Ann Arbor, in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Army canteens, etc.; which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FAIRBANKS presented the petition of Henry Holtzman and sundry other druggists of Elwood, Ind., praying for the repeal of the stamp tax upon proprietary medicines, perfumeries, and cosmetics; which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HALE presented the petition of J. J. Lord, of Ellsworth, Me., praying that he be granted compensation for the preservation of the bark *William* from destruction during the late civil war; which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. CULBERSON presented a petition of the faculty of the University of Texas, praying for the establishment in the Indian Territory of a system of public free schools, to be controlled by proper authorities of the United States Government; which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. BATE presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Deer Lodge, Tenn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in Alaska, Hawaii, the Philippines, Porto Rico, and Cuba; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PETTIGREW presented a petition of 60 citizens of Mount Savage, Md., praying for the public ownership of railways, telegraphs, and telephones, and for the passage of Senate bill No. 1770, relative to the acquisition, purchase, construction, and condemnation by the United States of railroads lying within the United States, the respective States, and the District of Columbia, engaged in interstate commerce, etc., and remonstrating against the passage of Senate bill No. 1439, to amend the interstate-commerce law; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. VEST presented a petition of the Kansas City Live Stock Exchange, of Kansas City, Mo., praying for the enactment of legislation to extend the limit of time for the transportation of live stock from one State to another; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. FRYE presented sundry petitions of the Ex-Slave Mutual

Relief, Bounty, and Pension associations, of Tehula, Miss., praying for the enactment of legislation granting pensions to ex-slaves; which were ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 2767) granting a pension to Nellie L. Parsons;

A bill (S. 3890) granting an increase of pension to Americus V. Rice;

A bill (S. 3517) granting an increase of pension to Adam Velten;

A bill (S. 4555) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Longfellow; and

A bill (S. 4420) granting an increase of pension to James Irvine.

Mr. GALLINGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4441) granting a pension to Gertrude B. Wilkinson, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 3267) granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Mocar; and

A bill (H. R. 6494) granting an increase of pension to Dorus M. Fox.

Mr. KYLE, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4553) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Rippleman, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally with amendments, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 56) granting a pension to Sayer Jensen; and

A bill (S. 946) granting a pension to Stephen Johnson.

Mr. KYLE (for Mr. PRITCHARD), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2430) granting a pension to Mary C. Williams, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. TURNER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 352) to increase the pension of Catherine A. Young, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7418) granting an increase of pension to George Garrett, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. KENNEY), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 1625) granting an increase of pension to Mary B. Douglass, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. BATE, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3763) to authorize the Secretary of War to cause to be investigated and to provide for the payment of all just claims against the United States for private property taken and used in the military service within the limits of the United States during the war with Spain, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. SHOUP, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred an amendment relative to the establishment of a Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers on the Fort Sherman military reservation in Idaho, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. QUARLES (for Mr. KENNEY), from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4128) granting a pension to Hester A. Phillips, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. KENNEY), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3991) granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Solomon, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. KENNEY), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2954) granting an increase of pension to Elam Kirk, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. QUARLES, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 9643) granting a pension to Ada E. Whaley;

A bill (H. R. 4086) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Lockwood; and

A bill (H. R. 4355) granting an increase of pension to Oren E. Barber.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4574) granting an increase of pension to Mary Emily Wilcox, reported it with amendments, and submitted a report thereon.

He also (for Mr. ALLEN), from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 8559) granting an increase of pension to Margaret R. Clune, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7230) granting an increase of pension to Roxie B. Salter, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (S. 4020) to amend the act of Congress approved May 14, 1880, entitled "An act for the relief of settlers on the public lands," reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FAIRBANKS, from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. MONEY (for Mr. WARREN) on the 8th instant, relative to the purchase of the property known as the Corcoran Art Gallery, Washington, D. C., intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, submitted a favorable report thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. SIMON, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation of Arid Lands, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by Mr. CARTER on the 11th instant, proposing to increase the appropriation for gauging the streams and determining the water supply of the United States, including the investigation of underground currents and artesian wells in arid and semiarid regions from \$50,000 to \$250,000, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. McMILLAN, from the Joint Committee on Centennial of the Establishment of the Seat of Government in Washington, to whom was referred the amendment submitted by himself on the 14th instant authorizing the President of the United States to appoint an architect, a landscape architect, and a sculptor to make an examination and report plans for the enlargement of the Executive Mansion, and proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for services and expenses incident thereto, intended to be proposed to the sundry civil appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be printed and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Appropriations; which was agreed to.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas, from the Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (S. 1350) for the relief of the Little Rock and Memphis Railroad Company, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Claims; which was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom was referred an amendment submitted by himself on the 11th instant proposing to appropriate \$300 to pay for services rendered to the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico in preparing the document entitled "Organic Acts for the Territories of the United States," etc., intended to be proposed to the general deficiency appropriation bill, reported favorably thereon, and moved that it be referred to the Committee on Appropriations and printed; which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. CAFFERY (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4697) granting an increase of pension to Marie E. Pillow; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4698) for the relief of the estate of Marcus Walker, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. PETTIGREW introduced a bill (S. 4699) granting an increase of pension to Patrick H. Smith; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MCENERY introduced a bill (S. 4700) granting an increase of pension to Mrs. J. N. Ball; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4701) granting an increase of pension to Bridget Swan; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 4702) to confirm to the administratrix of the estate of Lucretia Williams the title to one square league of land in the State of Louisiana (with an accompanying paper);

A bill (S. 4703) for the relief of the estates of W. R. Brown and Mrs. Elmyra Brown, both deceased;

A bill (S. 4704) for the relief of Lucy J. Boyle;

A bill (S. 4705) for the relief of the estate of Henry Bauman, deceased; and

A bill (S. 4706) to amend the act approved March 3, 1899, for the allowance of certain claims for stores and supplies reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the act approved March 3, 1883, and commonly known as the Bowman Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper).

Mr. NELSON introduced a bill (S. 4707) granting an increase of pension to John Sirrine; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. MCCOMAS introduced the following bills; which were severally read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on Claims:

A bill (S. 4708) for the relief of Eugene L. Derr, executor of the estate of John Derr, deceased;

A bill (S. 4709) for the relief of Lorenzo Thomas, jr., and Henry C. Thomas;

A bill (S. 4710) for the relief of the estate of George Smith, deceased;

A bill (S. 4711) for the relief of Catherine Winters; and

A bill (S. 4712) to confirm title to lots 3, 4, and 5 in square 979 in Washington, D. C. (with accompanying papers).

Mr. THURSTON introduced a bill (S. 4713) to provide for the registration of married Indians, and for the licensing, the legal performance, and the recording of marriages among reservation Indians, or between reservation Indians and others; and to make definite and to record the family relations of Indians who have not yet received allotments of land in severalty; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SEWELL introduced a bill (S. 4714) granting an increase of pension to John D. Ferguson; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4715) to incorporate the National Soldiers' Aid Society; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. GALLINGER introduced a bill (S. 4716) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Dyhrenfurth; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. JONES of Arkansas (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4717) for the relief of Charles H. Kumpe, administrator of the estate of John Kumpe, deceased; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4718) to disapprove an act passed by the legislative assembly of the Territory of New Mexico, approved February 23, 1899; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Territories.

Mr. DANIEL introduced a bill (S. 4719) granting to the Ballston Railroad Company, a corporation incorporated under the laws of the State of Virginia, certain powers and privileges within the District of Columbia; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4720) for the relief of Tandy Duval; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also (by request) introduced a bill (S. 4721) for the relief of Mrs. Louisa C. Urquhart; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. MASON introduced a bill (S. 4722) for the relief of Prentiss B. Reed and Lucretia H. Reed Regnier; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Revolutionary Claims.

Mr. BAKER introduced a bill (S. 4723) for the relief of J. A. Towle; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4724) to remove the charge of desertion against William T. Grady; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4725) for the relief of Morton A. Pratt; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4726) granting a pension to Delila F. Russell; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 4727) granting a pension to Martha Ann Sanders; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. SIMON introduced a bill (S. 4728) granting an increase of pension to Marvin V. Tufford; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. CAFFERY submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to state an account with Morgan's Louisiana and Texas Railroad and Steamship Company for transporting the United States mails over postal routes Nos. 30003 and 149003 during the period between July 1, 1878, and February 21, 1892, and pay to said company such sum as shall remain due, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. KYLE (by request) submitted an amendment granting to

S. H. Slaughter the free use of 100 to 200 acres of suitable and available ground on the Island Reservation or Lee farm for a sufficient number of years for the purpose of demonstrating the growing, harvesting, and preparation of ramie fiber for market, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

He also (by request) submitted an amendment directing the Secretary of the Interior to help establish one ramie fiber, silk, and flax demonstration station in or near Washington, D. C., and proposing to appropriate \$110,000 for the encouragement and development of the same, intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FOSTER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,529.20 to enable the Attorney-General to pay James C. Drake, late United States marshal in the State of Washington, for moneys expended in connection with his duties as such marshal, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. LODGE submitted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of the Treasury to pay \$998.96 to Capt. B. Tellefsen, master of the Norwegian steamer *Albert*, for expenses incurred by him in consequence of a violation of Article XIII of the treaty of commerce and navigation between the United States and Sweden and Norway, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. GEAR submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$325 to pay Daniel M. Reiter for services as a folder from July 1, 1899, to January 1, 1900, inclusive, etc.; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. SPOONER submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$11,167.35 to be paid to the devisees named in the will of James W. Schaumburg, deceased, being the amount of the pay and allowance of a first lieutenant of dragoons from July 1, 1836, to March 24, 1845, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—SENATOR FROM MONTANA.

Mr. CLARK of Montana. Mr. President, I rise to a question of privilege personal to myself. It had not been my intention to disturb the recognized traditions of this most honorable body by intruding my opinions upon any questions that might arise for consideration during the present session; but the question called up to-day for discussion so vitally concerns my own interests, and the interests of the great State which I have the honor in part to represent, that I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate while I, as briefly as possible, submit some remarks, referring, first, to the character of the investigation; second, to the majority report of the honorable Committee on Privileges and Elections, which has submitted findings adverse to the retention of my seat in the Senate; third, to the conditions existing in the State of Montana for a number of years prior to my election which justified my political action; and, lastly, a statement as to the course I deem best to pursue in the premises.

It is not my desire to cast any aspersions upon the motives which actuated the distinguished Senators composing the committee, and yet, with the most respectful consideration for the learning, legal ability, and eminent standing of these gentlemen, I am forced to the conclusion, which I believe meets with the concurrence of not only a large number of Senators on both sides of this Chamber, but also to 80 per cent of my constituency in the State of Montana, regardless of political affiliations, that the methods of procedure in the investigation of this matter were manifestly unfair, nonjudicial, and that they resulted in a verdict of the committee entirely opposite to that which would have occurred should the evidence have been confined to that which was admissible and pertinent to the issue.

I contend that an investigation involving a seat in the highest legislative body of this nation, as well as the honor of an individual chosen for that position by the people of one of the sovereign States thereof, should be conducted in a strictly judicial manner, and that in the proceedings the established rules of evidence should be applied. It is well known to everybody that this was not the case. It is true that there was a strong effort made by the honorable Senators from Alabama, Maryland, Kansas, and North Carolina at the beginning of the investigation to exclude all the irrelevant testimony, but their efforts were unavailing.

The Senators who filed a minority report expressed in emphatic terms their condemnation of the proceedings in this respect, as well as a denunciation of the character and practices of the principal attorney and of some of the witnesses who testified for the prosecution.

The result of the admission of all kinds of hearsay, irrelevant, malicious, and perjured testimony was damaging in the extreme to my case, as through the medium of both the respectable and

venal press the most widespread publicity was given throughout the land to some of the most pernicious falsehoods touching myself and likewise a large number of the most eminent and upright legislators who supported me, and who are the peers of the boasted men of any State in this Union.

The prevailing theory of presumptive innocence was largely ignored, and the entire proceedings were closely analogous to the Dreyfus case, where the prosecution was based upon a presumption of guilt. The precedents that have been established in examinations of this character since 1785 have been lightly considered, if not entirely disregarded. It has heretofore been held that there must be proved actual complicity of fraud on the part of the principal or actual, not presumptive, knowledge of corruption on the part of his agents, or that it must be proved, not inferred, that a sufficient number of legislators have been corruptly influenced to change the result of the election.

As to the first proposition, no proof was adduced that was accepted by the committee, and no charge of complicity has been made in the report.

As to the second proposition, not in a single instance, in my opinion, or in the opinion of the eminent counsel who aided me in this investigation, has there been any proof sufficient to establish the guilt of a single legislator. On the contrary, positive evidence has been elicited in every case where the respondent was allowed to introduce testimony that no consideration was given or received or promise of any consideration made to secure a vote for the respondent.

In order to change the result of the election it would be necessary to establish that eight members of the legislature were corruptly influenced.

Much stress has been laid upon the comparative financial condition of two or three legislators before and after the Senatorial contest. These men gave a full explanation of the circumstances and conditions relating to such matters. The presumption is that if their financial condition was better, they acquired it innocently. This is a plain proposition of law, and the burden of proof did not rest upon them. From their well-known character I do not believe them dishonest, and even if they were it must be remembered that there was much legislation before that assembly, involving millions of dollars, in which some of the memorialists were deeply interested; and although they appear here as apostles of purity, it is well known in Montana they would not fail to test the probity of every man in the most unscrupulous manner to promote their own interests.

They were actively engaged in preventing the revision of the infamous election law, enacted at their instance, which the honest people of Montana were endeavoring to correct, with regard to the cross in the circle, by which these people have been enabled to coerce every man in their employ into casting his ballot to suit their wishes.

They were also deeply interested in attempting the repeal of a law that had been established by a previous legislature, requiring safety cages to be put into every mine, which law has been a "dead letter" so far as they are concerned and totally disregarded by them, although all other companies operating in the State of Montana complied with its provisions. Proceedings have been commenced against the Anaconda Company by the State inspector of mines to enforce a compliance with the provision of the statute, and a judgment obtained against them, which, I am informed, they are resisting by appeal to the higher courts and are operating to-day in utter contempt of the statute. It is charged that many lives have been lost by reason of this disregard of the law.

There was other legislation involving the transfer of property which was hotly contested by contending parties in Montana in which the respondent had no interest whatever.

Hence, if it could be shown that money was improperly used during the session of the legislature, there would scarcely be even a presumption that it was chargeable to the respondent or friends working in his interest.

I therefore submit, Mr. President, my belief that the conclusions of the committee on the main proposition, and those of a majority on all propositions, are inferential, incorrect, and are not supported by the evidence; and I confidently believe that after a thorough and fair investigation of the evidence and all the circumstances attending the investigation, the majority report would not be sustained.

FINDINGS.

Mr. President, I wish to revert to a few of the points set out in the findings of the report, and particularly where there was a direct personal reference to myself.

On page 2 of the report, under the head of "The admitted or undisputed facts," in subdivision 3, we read:

Senator CLARK has been constantly a candidate for office. He was a candidate for Congress in 1888 and defeated. In 1890 there were two legislatures in Montana. He was elected United States Senator by the Democratic legislature, but was not seated. He was a candidate for the Senate in 1893, but there was no election. In 1895 he was voted for as the Democratic candidate, but Senator CARTER was elected.

Are we to infer from the first statement that it is a crime to be

a candidate for office? Are not the very first lessons which are taught to our boys at home and in the schools as a stimulus to ambition and to foster a spirit of patriotism that one of the greatest privileges in a free government is the opportunities it presents to the humblest individual to rise to distinction, even to the highest position in the land?

The fact is that I never voluntarily sought to be elected to any office. In 1888 I was nominated by acclamation for Delegate in Congress, which I declined several times, and yielded finally, having been unable to resist the persistent and determined efforts of the delegates in the convention to press the nomination upon me. The Territory was Democratic by several thousand votes at that time, and I had the most positive assurances from Mr. Daly and all of his friends of their loyal support.

On the evening preceding the election he sent a train load of men from Anaconda to Butte, who bore torches in the procession which preceded a grand rally. Later in the evening rumors were current that Daly was disloyal. Three members of the Butte committee hired an engine and went to Anaconda, 28 miles distant, to confer with him, and he assured them that the rumors were false, and that he would go to Butte in the morning, pull off his coat, and go to work in the interests of the party.

At the opening of the polls his employees came flocking down the hill with Democratic tickets in their hands, except that the name of the Republican nominee was pasted over mine. The Australian system of ballot had not then been established, and there were shift bosses at all the polls who knew the men and made them show their tickets before depositing them. These gangs of men repeated several times, and in the precinct in which I live the vote was nearly double that cast at preceding and subsequent elections, and this was the case at other precincts.

This treacherous work was done everywhere in the several counties where Daly had men employed, and the result was my defeat by several thousand majority, and from this staggering blow of treachery the party did not recover for many years. There was no provocation for this. There had been no business difficulties and never an unkind word had been spoken between us. It was simply an envious and diabolical desire on his part to forever destroy my political influence in the Territory.

There were two legislatures in 1890, which grew out of the fraud of throwing out an entire precinct by a Republican canvassing board. I was made one of the caucus nominees by acclamation, without any solicitation on my part, and while the Senators, elected by a Republican legislature, were seated after a memorable discussion of several months' duration in this Chamber, in which a number of Senators present participated, so strong was the conviction of the unfairness of their election that they were repudiated by their own party in the State, and neither of them succeeded himself.

In 1893 there was a Democratic majority in joint convention of the members of the legislature, when, after the first ballot, I was the unanimous choice of the caucus, but six or seven members, most of them in the immediate employ of Daly, were by him held out of the caucus and voted continuously for Daly's attorney until the last day of the session, thus creating a deadlock, and preventing an election.

In 1895, when my distinguished colleague [Mr. CARTER] was elected, I was in Europe, and I believe that the only five or six Democrats in the legislature at that session gave me a complimentary vote.

This explanation, Mr. President, I deem to be necessary to eliminate any false impressions that may have obtained in the minds of anyone by reason of the prominence given to the subject by the honorable committee, by their having made it the leading part of the third subdivision.

The remaining portion of the article should be modified to conform to the evidence, which plainly shows that the organization alluded to was the result of an urgent appeal from some of the most prominent citizens of Montana, who were alarmed at the aggressions of the one-man power that was menacing the property interests and personal liberties of the people of the State, and which was intended to reduce the entire people to the same condition as then existed and to-day exists in certain localities where his sway is supreme—that of abject submission to his arbitrary rule.

In this connection I wish to state that my undertaking to break down Daly rule in Montana was made with the distinct, express understanding that my name should not be used in connection with the Senatorial race, and I defy anyone to show that I was such a candidate until after the election, and not until in December of 1898.

In Article VI, Mr. President, we find this statement:

In December, 1898, Senator CLARK began negotiations with one H. W. McLaughlin, a member of the legislature, for the purchase of his wood, lots, and sawmills.

This statement, Mr. President, is not correct, as all of the evidence states clearly that the negotiations were begun by Mr. Bickford, and not by me, in the month of September, and before Mr. McLaughlin was ever nominated for the legislature. The com-

panies with which Mr. Daly was connected had purchased about all of the lumber interests of the State, and put the price of lumber up several dollars per thousand, and being a large consumer, I was obliged to embark in the lumber business to prevent extortionate charges, and hence instructed Mr. Bickford, who then lived in Missoula County, the center of the large timber interests, to look up a favorable location, which he found in Mr. McLaughlin's possession.

The evidence shows that this transaction was a purely business enterprise, and was an exceedingly good purchase, as the capital stock has been increased from \$50,000 to \$150,000, and in addition to this I have since purchased individually to be held for the company over 300,000,000 feet of timber. All of the proceedings connected with this transaction were open, and the conveyances were duly recorded upon the conclusion of the negotiations as soon as the company was incorporated.

Mr. McLaughlin is an efficient manager, and is now in charge of the affairs of the company. The evidence of Mr. McLaughlin, Mr. Bickford, and myself all concur that the Senatorial matter was never once referred to by any one of us. This transaction was as clear as any ever transacted in the world, as the evidence shows, and the mention of it as a subject of one of the subdivisions of the report is, I respectfully submit, manifestly unfair. I hope that the Senators will read all of the testimony referring to this affair. It is convincing evidence of a weak cause, when such flimsy expedients as the McLaughlin incident are relied upon for support.

In Article VII, Mr. President, we find the following statement, which is absolutely unfounded, to wit:

Senator CLARK knew of Mr. Bickford's attempt to purchase the indebtedness which Woods owed.

There is not one word of evidence to show this to be a fact, and I here state upon my honor as a man and as a Senator that I never heard of that transaction until it was disclosed in the testimony during this investigation.

Mr. President, in Subdivision XII, there is a reference to an agreement between Mr. Fine and myself made during the session of the legislature to do certain work. The evidence shows that there was no agreement, but simply a statement made by me to him, after my election, we having heard from several sources that Clark, of Madison County, had been charged with unprofessional conduct, that I would like to have him look it up; and any other negotiations or payments of money I had no knowledge of and took no part in.

Mr. Fine testified that he procured considerable testimony for the purpose of disbarring Mr. Clark, of Madison County, and also procured a large number of witnesses to impeach Clark, of Madison County, in the Wellcome disbarment proceedings, for all of which he received a compensation from W. A. Clark & Bro. and Mr. Wellcome. I was absent from the State during all of this time, and had no knowledge of what transpired. Mr. Fine testified (page 839) that he was never offered anything, nor were any promises ever made to him, in consideration of his vote. He also testified that he had been a warm and loyal supporter of mine since my betrayal by Mr. Daly in 1888.

With regard to the Day incident, the subject of Subdivision XIV, I desire to correct the misstatement that—

On February 13 Senator CLARK personally wrote a letter directing that \$5,000 should be given to Mr. Day for his services in the legislature.

I never wrote a letter couched in such language. I simply stated that this amount should be paid to him as a testimonial of my friendship for him and my appreciation of the services that he had rendered me during a period antedating the legislature, and did not state that it was for services rendered in the legislature, but it was to include services to be rendered, if required, in any contest that might arise, which at the time was threatened.

Mr. Day has for many years been a warm personal friend of mine, and loyally supported me without any hope or promise of financial consideration. He had not been very successful financially, and I simply gratified my own impulse in making him a gift. It was a surprise to him, and both he and myself testified that it was not in pursuance of any previous understanding.

The law upon this proposition has been clearly stated in the brief submitted to the committee, and it is clearly shown that the payment of money made, as in this case, after election to a voter without a prior promise, expressed or implied, would not constitute bribery.

Perhaps, if I had used my influence to create a fat office at the expense of the State or of the Government with which to reward Mr. Day, as is frequently done in discharging political liabilities, the incident would not have aroused any criticism.

So much, Mr. President, for the so-called "undisputed facts."

WHITESIDE INCIDENT.

So far as the Whiteside incident and the conspiracy is concerned, I will simply say that on the briefest examination of all the testimony it must be apparent to the mind of any reasonable man, with any considerable political experience, that the charge against Mr. Wellcome is utterly absurd. Mr. Wellcome was educated in New England, and admitted there to practice at the bar,

and afterwards began his migration westward, stopping in St. Paul and in Dakota, where he practiced his profession, and landed in Montana ten or twelve years ago. He is an eminent lawyer, and has had a wide political experience amongst the cleverest politicians of the country.

He is a man of mature years and cool judgment. He was several times warned against the treacherous character of Whiteside and his connection with the Daly people. It is not possible that a man of his ability, experience, and sagacity could fall into such a trap, or that he would, if he were so disposed, attempt to bribe two men in the presence of each other, when, knowing the character of at least one of them, he might expect to be betrayed.

There is not a man living who knows John B. Wellcome who would for one instant believe such a story. The whole scheme is in accord with the tactics of the prosecutors in this case, as we were prepared to prove, but were not allowed to do so by the committee.

We offered to show by George E. McGrath, a reputable man, who was associated with the Daly faction in 1893, that a similar conspiracy was attempted at that time. His affidavit is as follows:

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, District of Columbia, ss:

G. E. McGrath, being duly sworn according to law, deposes and says as follows:

That he was a resident of Montana from 1890 to 1895; that during part of the time affiant lived in Montana he was connected, as an editorial writer, with a newspaper published in Butte called *The People*, owned by Mr. James B. Lehigh; that during his residence in Montana affiant was affiliated with the Democratic party of the State and took a part in the politics of the State.

During the fall of 1892 and the first half of the year 1893 affiant acted as secretary to the Democratic State central committee, having been elected to that office by the Democratic State central committee which was chosen at the State convention held in the fall of 1892. During his incumbency as secretary of the State central committee affiant came in contact with most of the prominent Democrats of the State and became well acquainted with many of them.

That after the fall campaign of 1892 affiant went to the city of Helena, which was at that time and now is the capital of the State, and was present during the Senatorial contest of 1893, at which time W. A. CLARK and W. W. Dixon were the rival Democratic candidates for the United States Senate, and W. F. Sanders and Lee Mantle were the Republican candidates.

That during the progress of the contest for the office of the United States Senate affiant was brought into frequent and intimate political relations with Marcus Daly, who was the leader of one faction of the Democratic party and who supported the candidacy of W. W. Dixon for the United States Senate, whose candidacy was advocated by the paper on which affiant was at that time an editorial writer.

W. A. CLARK became the caucus nominee of the Democratic party. At the request of Mr. Daly affiant accompanied him to Helena for the purpose of assisting him in encompassing the defeat of Mr. CLARK for the United States Senate by whatever means that would best bring about that result. That affiant was in frequent consultation with those who were opposing Mr. CLARK, and during such consultations ascertained the methods to be employed and means adopted to bring about the defeat of Mr. CLARK.

At the first joint session of the legislature affiant was requested by Mr. Daly to attend and ascertain the vote of the members for United States Senator. Immediately after the vote was recorded affiant returned to Mr. Daly's headquarters in the Merchants' Hotel, in Helena, and reported the vote on that day, which, to the best of affiant's recollection, stood as follows:

Mr. W. F. Sanders, 35 votes; W. A. CLARK, 15 votes; Samuel T. Hauser, 11 votes; W. W. Dixon, 8 votes; Samuel Mulville, 2 votes; and Martin McGinnis, 1 vote.

Mr. Daly said upon hearing the vote that it was perfectly satisfactory, and that he thought he could bring influence to bear upon Mr. Hauser that would keep him in the fight as a candidate, and that if that could be accomplished, they might have no fear of CLARK being elected at this session. About two days after that it became known that the Democratic members of the legislature were to hold a caucus for the purpose of uniting upon some one candidate for United States Senator.

Every Democratic member was invited to attend this caucus, and the members under Mr. Daly's control sought his advice as to whether or not they would attend, and Mr. Daly absolutely refused to give his consent for them to attend that or any other caucus called for the purpose of selecting a candidate for the United States Senate except upon the express condition that Mr. CLARK should retire from the contest. Affiant heard Mr. Daly express himself to the foregoing effect, and his followers did not attend the Democratic caucus when the same was held.

The caucus was called, however, and the following day at the joint assembly of the legislature Mr. CLARK received 25 votes in consequence of having received the support of the caucus. Mr. Hauser having retired in his favor. On the evening of that day there was a large gathering of the Daly followers at the headquarters, at which affiant was present, and the political situation was discussed among them. Mr. Daly said at that meeting that the fight was now on in earnest, and that he expected every man who claimed to be a friend of his to do his full duty.

He said that the Democratic party of Montana, as represented by the 25 men who had voted for Mr. CLARK, had thrown defiance to him and his friends, and that so far as he was concerned he proposed to meet it and fight them and Mr. CLARK to a finish, and that so long as he lived Mr. CLARK would never be elected to represent Montana in either branch of the National Congress. He said that the best that his friends could do now was to go out and circulate among the members of the legislature and use every effort in their power to prevent them (the members of the legislature) from voting for Mr. CLARK.

Most of the crowd took their departure at this time, and soon after Mr. James B. Lehigh and affiant, in taking their leave from Mr. Daly, asked him if he had any suggestions to make for the week's issue of their paper. Daly said that there was no doubt but what "we" have a big fight on our hands; that the only way he could see to defeat CLARK, now that he was the regular caucus nominee, was to completely discredit him in the public mind.

He said that that could be done by charging him morning, noon, and night with bribery, attempted bribery, and the commission of about every other crime on the calendar, and to keep the fact before the people that the Northern Pacific Railway "robbers" had brought Mr. CLARK forward as their candidate, and to keep insisting upon this line, and perhaps a public sentiment would be created that would compel Mr. CLARK to retire.

He added that if some of his men could only obtain some money from Mr. CLARK, or his agents, on a promise of voting for him, and then arise in the legislature and exhibit the money, and state how they procured it, and from

whom they had procured it, that he had no doubt but what that would settle the contest, and that CLARK would not only be defeated, but would be henceforth politically dead in the State of Montana. Affiant stated at that time that if Mr. CLARK was really trying to obtain votes by the use of money that it would be simply a case of retributive justice for anyone to accept the money and exhibit it in the legislature.

Daly said that this move was necessary for these reasons: First, that no member of the legislature who had not as yet voted for CLARK would dare to do so, through fear of being charged with being a bribe taker; second, that Mr. CLARK and his managers would be handicapped in their work, because they would be continually afraid of being jobbed; and, third, that the public antagonism this move would create against CLARK would be so strong that the opposition would have to quit, and the CLARK forces would break up, and leave his (Daly's) friends masters of the situation.

From that time on it was well and generally understood by Mr. Daly's friends that efforts were being made to entrap Mr. CLARK or his managers to give up some money to members of the legislature. This condition of affairs continued until about the second week of February. At that time Hon. Lee Mantle, of Butte, Mont., succeeded Hon. W. F. Sanders, of Helena, as the choice of the Republican members of the legislature for United States Senator.

A Mr. Annear, from Silver Bow County, a Republican, and Mr. Coder, from Fergus County, also a Republican, refused to support Mr. Mantle as a substitute for Mr. Sanders, giving as their reason that they believed that Mr. CLARK would make an able and impartial representative of the whole people, and they cast their votes for Mr. CLARK. This break in the Republican vote of the legislature threw consternation into the ranks of the Daly forces.

Affiant was at headquarters soon afterwards and found Mr. Daly in quite a passion. Daly said that his men were a lot of "chumps" or they would have had some of CLARK's money before this to expose him, and the sensation he had contemplated would have taken place and CLARK would have never bothered them any more. He said that now that the break in the Republican side had occurred there was no telling where it would end, and that something radical had to be done. He then asked: "What is the matter with letting three or four of our men have a few thousand dollars for the purpose of showing in the legislature and stating that it is CLARK's money? This is the only way I now see to accomplish his defeat. What do you think of it?"

Affiant told him that it would be a very dangerous proceeding, and that if the CLARK men were at all bright they would immediately move to impound the money; and further, that it would be asking a great deal of his friends who had supported him so loyally to perform such a task as he had proposed. Mr. Daly answered that the situation was such that something more than Sunday-school politics was required, and left that part of the headquarters.

To the best of affiant's recollection, that there was present at this interview Peter Breen, of Butte; Charles Bonner, member of the legislature from Granite County; Michael Gorman, of Missoula, and probably one or two others whom affiant can not recollect.

GEO. E. McGRATH.

Sworn and subscribed to before me this the 19th day of February, 1900.

JOHN F. PARET, Notary Public.

Mr. McGrath was in attendance here for five weeks, but could not be heard.

This theory of the conspiracy was corroborated by the testimony of Thomas P. Cullen, State senator from Dawson County, who testified that he had a conversation with Mr. Daly in a dining car on board a certain train of which he (Cullen) was the conductor, in December, 1898, in which Daly stated that any man who voted for CLARK would be published as a boodler and bribe taker, and said:

If you fellows elect Mr. CLARK, I will see that he never takes his seat in the United States Senate.

This theory of conspiracy is also corroborated by Mr. Frank E. Corbett, of Butte, Mont., who testified before the committee, repeating a conversation which occurred between himself and Mr. Daly in New York City on or about December 24, 1898, in the Netherlands Hotel, in which Daly stated that if CLARK should show his head in the legislative assembly of Montana which was to convene the following January, that "we would hear something drop" that would drive CLARK and his friends out of Montana politics forever and drive some of them into the penitentiary.

This conspiracy on the part of the Daly forces to prevent my election by any means, either fair or foul, is corroborated by the testimony of Harry Ringwald. In a conversation had by him with Whiteside in the Park Hotel in Great Falls, Whiteside stated, after endeavoring to enlist the services of Mr. Ringwald in their behalf, "You keep quiet and wait a while, and you will hear a bomb explode, and you will know the rest after that." Whiteside also stated to Mr. Ringwald that he was going to spring a sensation on W. A. CLARK to prevent him from being elected, and said: "I am going to get \$50,000 for the job."

Statements made by William Berne in his testimony concerning conversations had with Fred. Whiteside also corroborate the theory on the part of the Daly forces to prevent my election.

Attorneys for the respondent also made an effort to produce two witnesses, Mr. B. W. S. Folk and his wife, from Kalispell, Mont., to prove an attempt by Whiteside to bribe Mr. Folk with an offer of \$1,000 to give him access to the vault of the court-house, where the ballots were deposited awaiting the action of the canvassing board.

Mr. Folk was deputy county clerk and custodian of the ballot boxes. This was in the fall of 1898, and Whiteside was a candidate for the State senate. Whiteside told Folk that he feared he was defeated and wanted to fix the ballots to save himself. Mrs. Folk was in an adjoining room and heard all of the conversation. This transpired in Folk's house at midnight. Whiteside was arrested and is now under bail to appear in June, when his trial is to take place. Mr. Folk and his wife, both of the highest standing for veracity and integrity, were in attendance here for four weeks, but the committee refused to hear them, although they afterwards

allowed evidence, in spite of objection by respondent's counsel, as to the amount paid by respondent to attorneys for the prosecution of Whiteside for the attempted bribe.

CONDUCT OF REPUBLICAN LEGISLATORS.

The report also deals extensively with the conduct of the Republican legislators who voted for the respondent. With reference to this matter, Mr. President, the Senate should remember that the members of the legislature were better acquainted with local conditions than the Senate Committee on Privileges and Elections. They should also remember that the alleged exposure made by Whiteside on the 10th of January had been investigated by a grand jury shortly thereafter.

It should also be remembered that each legislator had an opportunity of investigating the truth or falsity of the charges made by Whiteside on his own account and in his own way. It should also be remembered that before the time when the final vote was had upon the election of Senator charges had been preferred against Whiteside in the State senate, and that he had been expelled therefrom by a vote of 14 to 10, both Democrats and Republicans joining in his expulsion from the senate. As a matter of fact, the exposure made by Whiteside had been disproved on January 28, and had been so disproved to the entire satisfaction of the great majority of the members of the legislature as well as the people of Montana.

The grand jury which investigated the matter was composed of seven of the very best citizens of Lewis and Clarke County. The particular fact which disputed the testimony of Clark, of Madison, Myers, and Whiteside was their own statements as to the manner in which they said they had received the money. The unscrupulous methods which were being pursued by those opposed to the respondent in his candidacy for the Senate and the well-known policy of that wing of the Democratic party to adopt any means, however unscrupulous they may have been, to bring about the result desired by them helped to bring about the final result of the contest.

The Republican members of the legislature had continuously, from the commencement of the session to and including the 27th of January, acted in accordance with the dictates of a caucus which was held by them from day to day. Their action of the 28th day of January, the day upon which the election took place, was not different from the acts of the party prior to that time.

A caucus was held, as shown by the testimony, and 9 out of the 15 members (1 being absent) voted in favor of supporting me. If the reasons given by the Republicans for voting as they did can be characterized as "pretenses and covers," so could any reason be so designated; and it is not a legitimate or fair argument that no effort was made by the Republicans to elect any other Democrat.

To say that any one man was responsible for the action of the Republican members is both unreasonable and contrary to the evidence. Phillips, Geiger, Ingersoll, and, in fact, every Republican who testified showed that the action of the members of that party on the Senatorial question was in response to an almost unanimous public sentiment evidenced by letters, petitions, telegrams, and by delegations from the various counties of the State urging that the members of their party should vote for and support the respondent.

On page 9 of the majority report it is stated that Senator Hobson is mainly responsible for the action of the Republican members. It is also stated in a previous paragraph that the respondent had been negotiating with Mr. Hobson, the leader of the Republicans, and again in the following paragraph that Mr. Hobson early began negotiations with Mr. CLARK; not one statement of which is sustained by the testimony. There is no evidence to show that any negotiations were had between Senator Hobson and the respondent; nor is it true that any negotiations of any character whatsoever were pending between them.

It is also stated as follows:

No one pretends that any effort was made to bring about the election of any other Democrat than Mr. CLARK.

It may not appear in the evidence, but it is nevertheless a fact known to every member of the Republican caucus, that ex-Senator Thomas C. Power did appear before the said caucus, and urged that the votes of the Republicans should be cast for Daly's candidate, W. G. Conrad. This is a fact that no one will dispute.

To say that Senator Hobson had any more voice in the matter than other members of the Republican party or was actuated by improper motives is an injustice to one of the most highly respected citizens of the State.

Again, the committee is in error when it reports that Mr. Hobson is a man of moderate means. Such is not the case. The only direct testimony bearing upon this subject is that of Frank E. Wright, on page 980, where he says, in answer to a question as to the reputed wealth of Mr. Hobson:

It is supposed that he is a wealthy man; probably worth two or three or four hundred thousand dollars.

This testimony is undisputed, and is corroborated by the fact that the testimony shows that Mr. Hobson is the leading business

man of his county, has large interests in mining operations, and cattle and sheep raising.

Senator Hobson was summoned to appear before the committee and was in attendance here for twenty-two days, but for reasons which are not stated in the report of the committee was never called as a witness.

The letter referred to in the testimony a shaving been written by the respondent to Mr. Hobson was addressed to him as the chairman of the Republican caucus, and because of this fact alone. The testimony is clear and undisputed that there was no understanding or agreement concerning the vote of Senator Hobson; that he was ever promised or given any consideration for his support, and the Senate should not draw any conclusion or inference from transactions had subsequent to the election which would overthrow the presumption of the honesty of ordinary business relations.

That Mr. Hobson owed \$20,000, which he paid in 1899, and went to Europe at about the same time as myself, when the testimony shows that the amount mentioned is not unusual for the man to owe, and that payment was made at about the season of the year when large payments are usually made; that I did not see Mr. Hobson on his European or Eastern trip, and that when he was in Europe sold a valuable mine, certainly could not have left much ground for the committee to base its ever-ready suspicion upon.

It is not proper that any inference should be drawn by the committee concerning the stock transaction which was had with ex-Senator Power. This transaction occurred long after my election to the United States Senate, and it is disclosed by the testimony that Senator Hobson had nothing to do with it.

The testimony disclosed the fact that this bank-stock transaction was a purely business deal, having no relation to the Senatorial controversy, and there is nothing in the evidence from which the committee could infer that one dollar of the purchase money went to anyone except the party from whom the stock was purchased. Nor can it be said that the fact of the transfer of the stock upon the books of the company or a failure to transfer the stock upon the books of the company is a circumstance which should be taken into consideration by the committee.

The testimony clearly shows that the reason why no transfer of the stock had been made upon the books of the bank was that the purchaser had been absent in Europe until June, 1899, and that no direction had been left for such transfer to be made. No presumption of wrongdoing could be drawn from the failure to transfer stock.

So much stress is put upon the violation of the Montana statutes that I deem it my duty to refer to the same briefly. The first finding of the committee refers to the violation of laws, and in Subdivision II is again referred to.

Comment is made upon the fact of the enactment of a law relating to crimes against the elective franchise, meaning thereby the act of February 25, 1895.

It may be a matter within the knowledge of the Committee on Privileges and Elections that the act of February 25, 1895, is a part of the work of a code commission, provided for by a previous legislative assembly of the State of Montana, and that the three codes of Montana—the political code, the civil code, and the criminal code—were passed by a legislative assembly of the State of Montana on the strength of a report of the code commission which had prepared and presented to the legislature the codes mentioned, and that under a suspension of the rules, and without reading or without other consideration than that which had been given to the codes by individual members outside of the legislative halls, these codes were passed.

They were not passed for the purpose of meeting a special contingency at the time of the passing of the act; were not passed for the purpose of preventing the commission of crimes against the elective franchise, because crimes of that kind were known to be prevalent, but were a part of a large compilation of laws intended for the guidance of the people of the State and covered every subject of criminal law contained within the criminal codes of the State. It should be observed in this connection that the laws of Montana provide a punishment for crimes against the elective franchise. Among other provisions is one that a fine of \$1,000 may be imposed for the violation of these laws, but nowhere in the laws is it provided that a violation of the law shall forfeit the office because of such violation.

This attempt on the part of the Committee on Privileges and Elections to deprive a man of a public office to which he has been elected is adding a new punishment to the laws of Montana. The committee practically seeks to enact laws for the State of Montana, and at the same time to enforce the punishment of the laws so enacted by a Federal tribunal. The committee has seen fit in its wisdom to take the place of the legislature of Montana, the courts of Montana, and the executive officials of the State, and by reason of its ruling in this matter to govern affairs in Montana instead of allowing these affairs to be governed by local tribunals and magistrates.

It is quite true that the law of Montana provides both a fine

and imprisonment for persons omitting to make the return required by law; but at no place is it provided that the person shall be deprived of an office to which he has been elected by reason of his failure to make such return.

The committee should have allowed the legal authorities to deal with the question of violation of Montana laws.

The committee should have taken into consideration the fact that a legal tribunal had inquired into the facts and circumstances surrounding the alleged violation of laws of the State with reference to bribery of members of the legislature, and had decided against the question of there having been an undue use of money in the election of United States Senator. The tribunal mentioned was the grand jury of Lewis and Clarke County, which heard all the evidence introduced in this case and went over the whole question at a time when the facts were fresh in the minds of all concerned, and when the witnesses introduced before that tribunal had not had an opportunity to mold their stories nor manufacture such evidence as to create a deeper impression than the truth would warrant.

It is to be presumed that the members of the grand jury were acquainted not only with the evidence given before them, but were also acquainted with local conditions, and that the investigation was made as severe and as searching and as complete as was possible under the circumstances.

Mr. President, I have only one more reference to make to the report, and that is the remarkable statement relating to the "criticism of the prosecutors," wherein we find the following clause:

Some members of the committee, however, do not join in any criticism of Mr. CAMPBELL and Mr. Daly.

I construe this to mean, therefore, that all of the conduct of these men is approved by at least two members of the committee. I do not desire to draw any conclusions, but I am constrained to call the attention of the Senate to the character of Mr. CAMPBELL as shown by the record and the evidence.

He first appeared as a pretended friend of the cause of cooperation in the interest of good government in Montana, where at a conference he feigned sleep in order to obtain information which he might use to betray his friends. Not then knowing his true character, he received the support of myself and all my friends, which insured his nomination and election. Immediately thereafter he threw off the mask and went to work to encompass my defeat, having been employed, as he stated, as counsel for a mining company belonging to the Anaconda Company at a salary of \$5,000 per annum, ostensibly as a blind, as he could not remember on the witness stand the name of the company for which he pretended to act.

He labored almost incessantly for almost a year in procuring perjured testimony, as was fully disclosed by the 19 pages of affidavit which he procured from Ben Hill, which Hill refused to testify to on the stand, and afterwards did testify that CAMPBELL knew that the trumped-up statements therein, suggested largely by him with the diabolical object in view of my complete destruction, were false as hell.

The evidence shows that he had numerous detectives employed in Montana, New York, and Washington to dog my steps, and all my friends, to lay, if possible, a foundation for plausible perjured testimony.

He brazenly admitted having conspired to open private letters and, with apparent exultation, stated that he would do so again, notwithstanding that it was a penal offense, of which he claimed to be ignorant.

Some of his correspondence with his detectives was read before the committee which exposed the degradation of the man, and one was so vile and obscene that it could not be read openly, and the loathsome thing was passed from hand to hand and read by each member in silence and with evident disgust. This portrays the character of this man, who was honored by an election to an office the duties of which he entirely neglected, scarcely ever having answered a roll call until the investigation was ended, and for the first time in the history of this Government violated the courtesy that common decency would suggest, and which has always been respected, by appearing in the prosecution of a member of a coordinate branch of the National Congress; and yet, Mr. President, it appears that there are some members of the committee who have no criticisms to make of the conduct of such a man.

Mr. President, there has been considerable reference to the large expenditure of money which I testified to having authorized.

It must not be overlooked that these expenditures covered three distinct campaigns, beginning with the primaries in August, 1898, and extending to the last of January, 1899, as fully appears in the testimony and in the briefs and arguments by the counsel for the respondent.

If the Senators knew the conditions which confronted the people of Montana they would not wonder that such action was necessary.

I entered the Territory of Montana, or rather the territory of which Montana was afterwards created, in 1863. Marcus Daly

made his advent in 1876—thirteen years later. In all that intervening time I took an active interest in politics, and never in all that period did I ever see or hear of a dollar having been paid for a vote. Those who lived there during that period will bear me out in this statement.

He introduced the system soon after his advent, and through this and the coercion which he invariably employed his success was almost always certain.

Although claiming to be a Democrat, he really had no politics, and elected judges, sheriffs, mayors, and other officers whom he knew would best subserve his purposes regardless of their politics, giving the preference oftentimes to Republicans.

In 1889 the Democratic party, more in fear than love of his influence, elected him as chairman of the State committee.

He had one of his attorneys nominated for Representative in Congress. That was the time that the large assessment referred to by Governor Hauser was made. It was amazing; but we all yielded, as party feeling was pretty strong at that time.

His tactics did not win, with the exception that his attorney was pulled through by less than 300 votes.

After the election the State committee met at Helena to settle up affairs and console each other, and when some member of the committee, who was doubtful as to his section having received a proper distribution of funds, asked the chairman for a statement of disbursement, she blandly replied that the books were burned.

It was at this election that at Anaconda he had a large number of ignorant Italians, Austrians, and Slavonians at work in the smelters of the company.

I may state here that these men were not naturalized, or very few of them were, until the day they voted or a few days prior to the election; that he had the judge in that district busily engaged in naturalizing them as fast as they could be taken before him, and he sent train loads of them to Butte to appear before the courts there to be naturalized in order to vote at the coming election. They could neither read nor write English, and therefore could not make out their tickets. Judges of election could assist electors only when physically disabled or ignorant. These men were led like animals to the polls, carrying a tag on which was printed, "I can not read or write the English language. I want to vote the Democratic ticket."

When the Australian ballot was adopted it was thought some protection might be had. It provided that a cross should be made after the name of each candidate for whom the elector desired to vote. This gave the elector employed by Mr. Daly too much independence. So the law was changed, as referred to in these remarks, so that a circle was placed above the candidates of each political party, which were in separate columns, so that the entire ticket of any one party could be elected by making a cross in the circle above any one column.

The booths were so constructed that the men on guard to watch could readily see what circle each man crossed when he would hold it up to mark it.

It was to prevent an amendment to this law that the Anaconda forces fought so zealously at the last session of the legislature.

The system of coercion is so strenuous that no employee of that company can exercise the great privilege of independent suffrage guaranteed by our Constitution.

One of Daly's pet schemes is colonization from surrounding places into his great lodging house just previous to registration, but the most effective method adopted by him in Silverbow County is the repeating system at the primaries. This was practiced to a great extent in 1898. In one precinct there were more Daly Democratic votes cast at the primaries than the total vote of all the parties combined at the following election.

The total Daly registration in the county was 5,810 votes against 1,814 anti-Daly. At the election following the total Democratic vote was only 5,988. From this it is apparent that about 2,000 fraudulent votes were cast by the Daly people at the primaries. They practically took possession of the polling places.

A train was run from Anaconda to South Butte with a squad of men who repeated at several polling places. It was this infamous action that caused the loyal and honest Democracy of the county to refuse to support the county ticket, and for this they were denounced as bolters.

The boycott is another great weapon used by Daly and his associates. An example of this will illustrate. Mr. James H. Lynch, who was in business near the mines of Mr. Daly and largely dependent upon the employees thereof for support, was in the habit of cashing checks for the miners, and after deducting the amount due him paid the balance in cash. That was when they issued checks. They do not do so now, but compel their employees to go to their large department store to get the few dollars, if any is left, when their bills are paid.

Mr. Daly attempted to foist a water-supply system on the city of Butte. Mr. Lynch had been elected as a member of the council; and on account of the iniquity of the scheme refused to support it, as he was an honorable man and had the interest of the city at heart. A watch was thereafter stationed near the place of

business of Mr. Lynch. Every man that entered his place was discharged, and finally he had to close up.

That was during the Administration of President Cleveland, when it was supposed that I had some influence in securing appointments. Mr. Lynch besought me to endeavor to get him an appointment as postmaster at Butte, which I secured for him, and he was happy in the thought, as he expressed it, that "Marcus Daly could not boycott the man that sells postage stamps."

Every employee is now obliged to buy everything that they require at their department store or lose his position. Single men buy clothing that they do not need, and sell again at a reduced price to the pawn shops of Butte, which in consequence are strong competitors with the vendors of cheap clothing.

Everything imaginary is kept in that great store, from a sucking bottle to a coffin, in order to meet all the requirements of employees from the cradle to the grave.

In the great capital fight of 1894 this company spent, according to the best judgment of expert men, over \$1,000,000 to secure the location of the State capital at their own town, Anaconda, off to one side of the State, and served only by one bobtail railroad, and difficult of access from other parts of the State. This place is only 60 miles from the State line, and there is scarcely any settlement intervening.

In that election money flowed like water, and was offered to anyone who would take it. Thousands of young men casting their first vote were debauched.

Mr. Daly testified that about three hundred and fifty to four hundred thousand dollars were spent in that contest; but what credit can be placed upon the statements of a man who had the audacity to testify that he had no ill feeling toward me, when in the next breath he swore that he had authorized the unlimited use of money to crush me?

The testimony of one of the best men in Cascade County, who disbursed the capital funds in that county, can be procured that he disbursed in that county alone over \$80,000; and that is only one of 24 counties in the State.

What was the object of this gigantic effort and great expense? They could not hope to get in return one-tenth of the expenditures from the sale of lots which they owned.

The sole object in view was to get the seat of government where their thugs could control members of the legislature, and where the slick operators in Daly's employ could weave a subtle web around the governor, the members of the supreme court, and other officials, and thus complete a system of control so infamous and despotic that it would not be tolerated in Russia or anywhere else in the civilized or uncivilized world. Thank God, we broke down that effort of this great tyrant, and are now hoping to complete the work and remove the heel of the despot forever from the necks of our people.

My distinguished colleague [Mr. CARTER] labored with me in that memorable struggle. He knows the truth of all I say and will verify it. As it is to-day, he (Daly) endeavors to put his own attorneys on the bench of the districts where his companies have property interests and to control the election of members of the supreme court, so that nearly every corporation in the State has been compelled to reorganize under the laws of some other State for self-protection in order that actions at law or in equity may be commenced in the Federal court, where they have a reasonable hope of obtaining justice. This is a sad commentary on the existing affairs in Montana, but it is only too true.

In the city of Anaconda, which is dependent wholly upon the smelting works of Mr. Daly's company, he rules as a veritable czar, a name which has in fact been applied to him throughout the State. He has dominated every phase of community life—political, social, industrial, and commercial. The entire community has been completely at his mercy. Individuals and business firms have been raised or crushed at the bending of his finger, while political opposition has been the signal for practical banishment.

The Anaconda town site was originally located and platted by Mr. Daly and a few of his friends. Hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of lots were sold at high prices. People were induced to erect houses and to build up the city by the generous promises and predictions as to the plans of the company which emanated from Mr. Daly in occasional interviews published in his personal organ, the Anaconda Standard.

Most of the houses were built by men in the employ of the corporation, credit being given them for the material, which was also sold by the concerns owned or controlled by Mr. Daly. In many instances the owners of these houses, after paying installments upon them for one, two, or three years, suddenly found themselves persona non grata to Mr. Daly, and lost their positions and were compelled to sacrifice about all they had invested in their houses and lots. It is stated that about 600 homes in that town are now vacant.

Mr. President, I have not recounted a tenth of the insolent domination, the blacklisting, the boycotting, and political debauchery of this man and his associates, who have without cause or provocation pursued me so relentlessly, and whose perversion of wealth,

extracted from the great mines of Butte, has left in its train the financial and moral ruin of men, the misery of women and children, the destruction of personal liberty, and a blight and stain upon the fair name of our State.

Is there any wonder, Mr. President, that the liberty-loving people of Montana should become alarmed and seek financial help to throw off the great octopus that threatened everything that was dear to them?

How was it possible to attack this un-American despotism, strengthened by long years of undisputed success, without a great effort which only money could secure. I was in a position to aid in this work and I am proud that I undertook it. It was done legitimately and with honesty of purpose, and although here, where the conditions are not fully understood, I have received some censure, the honest people of my State approve my action and will accord me grateful recognition.

Mr. President, I was born amid the humble surroundings of farm life in Pennsylvania. I went to the West when a lad, educated myself as well as I could by my own exertions while working on a farm and teaching school for a few years, when a spirit of adventure led me to the Rocky Mountains, where I have lived, mostly in Montana, for thirty-eight years. For three years I worked in the mines, and then engaged in other pursuits, and my enterprises now extend from one ocean to the other. I employ thousands of men and pay them generously for their labor.

I am endeavoring to discharge my duty toward mankind. I have occupied many positions of honor and trust—was State orator at Philadelphia at the exposition in 1876; represented the State at the New Orleans Exposition; was president of both constitutional conventions in my State; was appointed major of the First Battalion of Montana Volunteers in the Chief Joseph invasion in 1878. I was never in all my life, except by such characters as are now pursuing me, charged with a dishonorable act, and I propose to leave to my children a legacy, worth more than gold, that of an unblemished name.

Mr. President, acting upon my own judgment and holding no one responsible for the result, I have concluded to place my resignation in the hands of the chief executive of Montana, and I here submit a copy of a letter addressed to him under date of May 11, and which is now in his hands:

UNITED STATES SENATE, Washington, D. C., May 11, 1900.

DEAR SIR: The Sixth legislative assembly on the 28th day of January, 1899, elected me to represent the State of Montana in the Senate of the United States for the term commencing on the 4th day of March, 1899.

Under the authority of the credentials signed by the governor of the State I entered upon the discharge of the duties of that position on the first Monday of last December, after qualifying by taking the oath of office prescribed by law.

On the 4th day of December, 1899, two memorials were presented to the Senate of the United States, praying that my right and title to continue to act as a Senator under the credentials which certified to my election should be investigated.

These memorials, with the accompanying papers, were referred to a standing committee of that body. After a protracted investigation of the allegations of said memorialists the committee has submitted its conclusion to the Senate, in which it finds that the seat which I now occupy under the credentials issued by authority of the vote taken in the joint assembly of the legislature on the 28th day of January, 1899, should be declared vacant.

None of the charges affecting my personal honor, or which alleged that I had personally been guilty of corrupt practices, have been sustained by the finding of the committee.

Conscious of the rectitude of my own conduct, and after a critical examination of all the evidence taken by the committee, convinced that those friends who were so loyal to me during that bitter contest did not resort to dishonorable or corrupt means to influence the action of the members of the legislature in their choice of a Senator, yet I am unwilling to continue to occupy a seat in the Senate of the United States under credentials which its committee has declared rests for their authority upon the action of a legislature which was not free and voluntary in its choice of a Senator.

Self-respect and due regard for the opinion of my associates, and a sense of duty to the people of the State of Montana, demand that I should return the credentials under which I am acting as one of the representatives in the Senate of the United States, leaving the State and her people to take such action as will conserve and promote her best interests in the national councils. Influenced by these considerations I deem it eminently proper without unnecessary delay to resign the position of United States Senator from the State of Montana, to which I was chosen by the Sixth legislative assembly of Montana on the 28th day of January, 1899.

With sentiments of esteem, I remain, respectfully, yours,

W. A. CLARK.

To His Excellency the GOVERNOR OF MONTANA,
Helena, Mont.

Mr. President, I desire, in retiring from the Senate, to state that I have here formed some warm attachments, which I regret to leave.

I have received from the honorable Presiding Officer the most courteous attention. I am deeply sensible of the generous sympathy and support of almost all of my Democratic colleagues, and for the cordial good wishes of a great number of Republican friends I wish to express my profound gratitude.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, in deference to the statement which has just been submitted to the Senate, I ask that the resolution touching the Montana Senatorial case may go over until 1 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Hampshire? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. O. L. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on the 14th instant approved and signed the following acts:

An act (S. 1284) for the relief of W. H. L. Pepperell, of Concordia, Kans.; and

An act (S. 2499) to authorize needed repairs of the graveled or macadamized road from the city of Newbern, N. C., to the national cemetery near said city.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa will yield for a moment. The morning business is not quite completed.

Mr. ALLISON. I learn just now that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ROSS] has given notice that he desires to speak for a brief time upon some matter pending before the Senate, and I will give way to him and also to routine business.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair will receive morning business.

LANDS AT NAVAL ACADEMY.

Mr. MCCOMAS submitted the following resolution; which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Printing:

Resolved by the Senate, That the papers from the authorities of the city of Annapolis, State of Maryland, which include certain correspondence of the proper United States naval authorities relative to the acquisition of certain lands adjoining the United States Naval Academy grounds, submitted to the Senate January 24, 1900, be printed, without maps or diagrams, as a Senate document.

MCLEOD BROTHERS.

Mr. HARRIS submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby directed to report to the Senate all the facts in the case of McLeod Brothers, of Marietta, Kans., which was investigated by order of the commission, including the appeal to the President and all correspondence relating thereto.

SARAH W. ROWELL.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a bill which has been returned from the House of Representatives with an amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2497) granting an increase of pension to Sarah W. Rowell.

The amendment was, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate nonconcur in the amendment made by the House of Representatives and ask for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, the President pro tempore was authorized to appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate, and Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TURNER were appointed.

POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I offer a resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the stenographer employed to report the hearings before the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads on the bill (H. R. 10301) making appropriations for the service of the Post-Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the law the Chair is compelled to send the resolution to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I will be obliged to the Chair if he will send it there.

I should like to give notice that on Thursday at the conclusion of the morning business I shall ask the Senate to take up the Post-Office appropriation bill. I would call it up to-morrow, but I postpone its consideration for the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY], who asked me to put it over a day.

STATUE OF GEN. ULYSSES S. GRANT.

Mr. HANSBROUGH, from the Committee on the Library, reported the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That during the exercises of the 19th instant, incident to the reception and acceptance of the statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, the committee of the Grand Army of the Republic on the Grant Memorial, the present commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, the senior vice-commander in chief, the junior vice-commander in chief, the surgeon-general, the chaplain in chief, the adjutant-general, the quartermaster-general, the inspector-general, the judge-advocate-general, and the senior aid-de-camp and chief of staff of the Grand Army of the Republic be admitted to the floor of the Senate.

CLAIMS AGAINST COLOMBIA.

Mr. HOAR submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the President be, and he is hereby, requested, if not in his opinion incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the Senate with

copies of all correspondence and papers in regard to the claims of Messrs. Isaacs and Asch and other citizens of the United States against the Government of Colombia, growing out of the withdrawal of the military forces and police from Colon by the Colombian Government, and the firing of the city by the insurgent, Pedro Prestan, in the year 1885.

CUBAN INVESTIGATION.

Mr. BACON. Mr. President, before the Senator from Vermont proceeds with the speech of which he has given notice, I desire to recall to the Senate the fact that on yesterday under the rule there was an order in reference to the resolution which I introduced relative to investigating the receipts and expenditures which have been made in Cuba. In view of the then pendency of the naval appropriation bill, the chairman of the committee asked the unanimous consent of the Senate that that resolution should go over, retaining its place, subject to my call in the morning hour.

I had intended to ask the consideration by the Senate of that resolution this morning. But for the question of privilege, to which the Senator from Montana [Mr. CLARK] addressed himself, I should have done so. Under the circumstances, of course it was impracticable and improper that I should call up the resolution.

The Senator from Vermont desiring now to go on, and this consent of the Senate relating as it does to the morning hour, I desire to say that in pursuance of that consent I shall ask the Senate to-morrow morning, immediately after the routine business, to consider the resolution.

CIVIL OFFICES IN ALASKA, HAWAII, ETC.

Mr. ROSS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2000 be taken up for the occasion of some remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays the bill before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2000) regulating appointment to and removals from civil offices in outlying dependencies of the United States.

Amendment of the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service. Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That all appointments to civil offices made by the President or any head of a Department in Alaska, Hawaii, or any place brought within the jurisdiction of the United States by the recent treaty with Spain, shall be made irrespective of the political opinions of the persons appointed, and, so far as consistent with the proper performance of the duties of the office, in such a manner as to represent the entire country. In case of removal from any such office, whenever practicable, charges shall be made in writing and a copy thereof furnished to the accused, who shall be afforded reasonable opportunity to make answer thereto; and the President or head of a Department making the appointment may, wherever the public interest shall seem to require it, suspend the official pending hearing or investigation of such charges."

Mr. ROSS. Mr. President, during the closing year of the century this nation has taken on new relations and entered upon the discharge of new duties. For the first time in her existence she has entered upon the difficult undertaking of governing dependencies, located quite remotely, having fixed customs and laws—growth of the centuries—the fundamental principles underlying which are the opposite of those which have ruled her existence.

I speak of them as dependencies because that word most clearly expresses their relation to this nation. "Territory" is a more general term and applies more strictly to the nation's ownership of the soil than to its relation to the inhabitants of the country. "Colony" less correctly expresses their true relation. Most of them are quite thickly populated and are not expected to become colonies nor to furnish a place for the overflow of our surplus population. All are, and for years will be, dependent, in a great measure, upon this nation for protection against foreign nations, for laws and their due administration. They may properly be denominated "dependencies."

Whether this new work shall redound to the nation's glory or shame depends largely upon the spirit and manner in which it is entered upon and conducted. It is a trite and true saying, "Well begun is half done." Well may Congress and the nation enter cautiously, conservatively, and thoughtfully upon the discharge of these new and important duties, in which the welfare of nearly or quite 100,000,000 people is more or less directly involved. The measure before the Senate, if enacted into law and obeyed in spirit, in my judgment will be most helpful in the proper discharge of these important and difficult duties. Its details will be considered later.

The present Congress will doubtless provide for permanent governments in Alaska, in Hawaii, in Porto Rico, and for less permanent governments in the Philippine Islands and in Cuba. None of these by the act of cession or annexation have the promise of eventually being given statehood. Whether any of them ever will be admitted as States is a question not ripe now for determination, nor even for consideration.

The conditions to be met and provided for in the several dependencies differ widely among themselves, and from any hitherto encountered by this nation. All the territories hitherto dealt with had, in advance, the promise, in due time, to be determined

by Congress, of being admitted into the Union as States. All were contiguous or nearly contiguous to some of the States, and their inhabitants largely came from the surplus population of the States. When admitted as States, and sometimes before, they were factors in the politics of the nation. These dependencies are quite differently situated. They are remote from any of the States; many of them densely populated, each with inhabitants peculiar to itself. Most of them have fixed laws and customs. For years they can exert no direct influence in the political policies and parties predominating in the nation. Questions as to their proper management and government may become involved in the policies of the political parties.

The conditions to be encountered differ widely in each dependency. Alaska is a country of magnificent distances, has a diversified population, widely scattered and mostly afloat, ready to pick up their few belongings and start at a moment's notice for the most recently discovered promising gold field. Very few of its inhabitants are permanently located or own the fee of the soil where their homes are located. They are also intermixed with the uneducated native tribes. The main industries are the salmon, the fur seal, and gold mining. The civil and criminal codes recently enacted are to be so applied, if possible, as to meet the peculiar conditions existing there.

In Hawaii the conditions are very different and much diversified. The natives, partially educated and civilized, the Portuguese, Japanese, Chinese, and peon laborers have each their national and other peculiarities, but are dominated by a comparatively small number of descendants from devoted American missionaries and by speculators of more recent arrival. They are a mixed population, in all stages of civilization and advancement, existing under established laws and institutions, coming from royalty down to their present status. Upon these has been ingrafted by Congress, little knowing what the existing laws are, the provisions of the civil government or Territorial act. The industrial conditions are also somewhat anomalous. The government of these islands presents no easy problem if they are to be successfully molded under and made subject to the fundamental principles of this Government.

The conditions in Porto Rico and the Philippine Islands are greatly unlike those which exist in Alaska or Hawaii. Each have existing customs and laws of similar origin and kind. But the inhabitants and industrial and other conditions to which the laws are to be applied, are dissimilar and peculiar and very different from those prevailing in Alaska and Hawaii. Porto Rico is generally under cultivation and well peopled. Its people are mostly of mixed origin; Indian, negro, and Spanish blood prevails in various degrees of intermixture. These constitute four-fifths or more of the population and are mostly laborers dependent upon their daily earnings for a living. They possess limited education and have little, if any, experience in governmental affairs. The other fifth are mostly merchants, planters, and professional men, better educated and possessing more wealth. There are few schools and very limited internal improvements. It will be no easy task to ingraft the recent civil-government act upon the existing laws and customs, and much more difficult to train the inhabitants into suitable ways of legislation, of living, and of thinking.

In addition to these peculiarities, in the Philippine Islands there are many races, speaking many languages, varying in attainments and civilization from savagery to a medium civilization. Between many of these tribes there exist bitter hostilities. Some portions of the islands are well and others sparsely populated. The islands vary in fertility and climatic conditions. Some of the tribes are fairly educated and others densely ignorant. They have no uniformity of religious or governmental views. Generally the best educated and most advanced in civilization are cruel, treacherous, and have slight regard for truth.

The nation's relations to Cuba are by the terms of the resolution of April 20, 1898, of temporary duration. I will not dwell upon the conditions existing there. Much that has been said of the conditions in Porto Rico will apply. Probably no civil appointments, under existing relations, will be made in that island, nor at present in the Philippine Islands. But in the assignment of military officers to discharge civil duties the same care and good judgment should be exercised as in making appointments to civil offices in the other dependencies.

The several civil government acts provide that the nation shall control, by appointees, the heads of the three departments in their government. This necessarily must continue so long as this nation is responsible to other nations and to its own people and to the people of the several dependencies for the conditions that shall exist in them. In every form of government responsibility and control are closely related factors. The one can not well exist in the absence of the other.

It is manifestly evident that to mould successfully the civil government acts into existing laws in these dependencies; to set up and establish the executive, legislative, and judicial departments; to administer them honestly, prudently, in the best inter-

ests of their respective and varied inhabitants, and in the best interests of the nation, demand that the appointees to control and administer these departments be men filled with the fundamental principles of our institutions, men of intelligence, of experience in governmental affairs, of excellent judgment, thoroughly honest, energetic, and heartily devoted to their work.

Statutes, however carefully formulated and nicely adapted to existing conditions, are lifeless and inert. Those who put them in operation, who mold, construe, and enforce them, give them life and action, effective to beneficial results. That these results may be most beneficial to every interest demands that the appointees be men of national qualities and characteristics, devoted to their work, earnest and practical. Unlike appointees for home work, to whom all the conditions and every detail are familiar, these appointees will go to new and unfamiliar fields, encounter comparatively a strange people, speaking an unknown tongue and surrounded by peculiar conditions. They must be given time to become acquainted with the people and their conditions. The whole nation, not the party in power, will be responsible for the results accomplished; every citizen will be more or less affected thereby.

It must be apparent that the appointees should be nonpartisan, should be national. This is what the bill demands, not rigidly, with no allowance for the exercise of discretion and judgment. Such requirement would be unwise. The requirement that these appointees shall be selected and commissioned by the President and heads of Departments casts upon them grave responsibilities, duties not easy of performance. They should be given reasonable discretion. But the principles which should control the exercise of this discretion should be clearly outlined, both to guide their action and the action of the Senate in confirming nominations for appointments. This is done by requiring the appointments to be made without regard to party opinions, and so as to represent the entire nation, or to be of national character. But no person possessing the qualities of mind and heart requisite to a successful performance of these difficult but important duties can be secured unless the position is reasonably secure from unjust removal and the service demanded be fully compensated.

The bill seeks to secure reasonable permanency by requiring removals to be made on charges preferred in writing with an opportunity to answer and be heard in regard to their truth. If appointments are nonpartisan, and removals made only on charges in writing, established by proof on hearing, men of high qualities of mind and character can be secured, men who will be exemplars, missionaries of the fundamental principles of this Government.

A measure of this kind should be inaugurated, and control the making of the first appointments. If the appointments, provided for in the acts establishing civil government in these dependencies, are once made on a partisan basis, subject to removal without filing charges or hearing, they will continue of the same character. The men appointed will not be of the highest class, men sought out for their qualities of mind, heart, and efficiency, men devoted to promoting the highest interests of those over whom they are given authority.

Such men always have desirable positions which they can not be induced to surrender to accept difficult positions for an uncertain period. On the contrary, there will be appointed men who have political pull, who are given a place to square political accounts, frequently men who have been active but incompetent or inefficient partisans, unable to command the support of honest citizens, and who bring pressure to secure appointment to some position removed from observation where they can secure large pay for diminutive service. If the appointees are from this class, removals must be expected to follow every change in the political administration of the Government. If such appointments are made and prevail, the nation will entirely fail in the discharge of its duty, and the condition of the dependencies be made worse instead of better. Rather than incur such results the nation had better, to its humiliation and disgrace, haul down the flag and leave the islands to go their own way.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. PETTUS in the chair). Will the Senator please suspend for a moment while the Chair lays before the Senate the regular order?

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the regular order may be informally laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

Mr. President, the soundness of these views, previously formed, has been confirmed by the report of the able commission sent to examine into the conditions and report a form of government to be established in the Philippine Islands. What they so well say in regard to the character and quality of service required of appointees, if made in these islands, applies with nearly equal force to appointments in Alaska and all the island dependencies. I read what they have so forcibly said on pages 113 to 116, inclusive, of their report:

A small number of American officials will be necessary for the Philippine service. The highest, according to the form of government recommended by the commission, may be divided into two classes.

In the first group belong the governor, secretary, attorney-general, certain judges, and other high officers of the Territorial government. To the second group belong the directing heads of the postal, customs, and other departments of the Federal service in the Philippines. It is not meant that in practice these groups should be isolated and kept apart, as they are in the States of the Union. Indeed, there are obvious advantages, including harmony of action and centralization of responsibility, in unifying as completely as possible all the branches and departments of government over which the Americans are to preside in the Philippines.

The members of the first group will be appointed by the President; those of the second, probably transferred from the home service. In neither case will there be examinations. Now, in neither of these groups is there any necessity for limiting the term of office except, of course, in the case of the governor, whose term should be long enough, however, to enable him to accomplish something. Under the scheme of government recommended by the commission half of the senate is to consist of appointed members, and it is assumed that the attorney-general, secretary, and other heads of departments would be appointed senators.

It would be extremely unfortunate if, when these officials had come to understand the language of the people and to appreciate their character, as well as to have gathered valuable experience, their places should be taken by novices, for whom the same elementary training would once more be necessary, and with whom again it would be balked of its proper fruition. The same considerations apply to the judges, the chiefs of the customs, post-office, and other departments of the Federal service. Permanency of tenure is therefore the first requisite in the highest offices which Americans will be called upon to fill in the Philippines; and to secure the best men—men who are qualified for the arduous task of shaping and guiding public administration in the Philippines—it is essential that high salaries should be paid.

Besides the executive, administrative, and judicial heads, who can not be selected by means of competitive examinations, there will be a small number of offices, intermediate between the heads of departments and the great body of native officials, in all branches of the government, for which it will be desirable to have American incumbents. Americans who are candidates for these positions should be subjected before admission to tests of fitness in the United States. They should then be promoted upon merit, and retained during efficiency and good behavior. In some cases it may be desirable on account of their experience and training to transfer men from the existing classified service to the Philippine service, and provision should be made to enable such officials to retain all their rights and privileges as classified employees. By whichever method secured, American officials in the Philippines should be offered salaries large enough to induce the most capable of their class not only to enter and remain in the service, but to give an honest, effective, and economical administration, free from any taint of corruption. The appointment to the service of the best men available, without regard to politics, and their retention as long as they discharge their duties satisfactorily, are, in the opinion of the commission, indispensable principles of administration in the Philippines.

With a view to facilitate the discharge of their official duties, as well as to promote mutual understanding, sympathy, and good fellowship between Americans and Filipinos, the commission holds it essential that the American members of the regular Philippine civil service should be required to learn the language of the people (Tagalog, Ilocano, Visayan, Vicol, etc.) among whom they live, and that facility in the use of such vernacular be a condition of all promotion. This requirement should be extended to the town and county commissioners or supervisors, if they are not as a class brought under the provisions of the civil-service regulations. The more an American official has to do with natives, the greater the need and the more imperative the duty of learning their language. By no other means can the two people be so speedily brought to understand and appreciate one another. Of course this recommendation is not inconsistent with another recommendation made by the commission—i. e., that English should be taught in the schools of the archipelago to the utmost extent feasible.

The business or merit system of civil service is economical of officials, for it aims only at the public good. The patronage system, on the other hand, creating offices for favorites irrespective of the needs of the country, implies an exorbitant number of officials. Good government being the result of the former system, the people are contented and only a small force is necessary. The patronage system, on the other hand, necessarily involves incapacity and extravagance, and issuing in misgovernment and corruption, alienates and embitters the governed, and necessitates in consequence large armies to keep them in subjection.

As has been shown elsewhere, Spain, prior to the last insurrection, spent annually more than \$4,000,000 on the Philippine army and more than \$800,000 on the civil guard, the latter being composed of 3,482 individuals and the former of 13,291, of whom, however, only 2,210 were Europeans. Burma, with about the same population, has a military force of about 15,000 men, of whom one-third are British and two-thirds Asiatic (almost entirely Indians); and the annual cost of the establishment is about 10,000,000 rupees. In addition, the civil police force of Burma consists of 13,000 men, at an annual cost of 3,563,697 rupees, and military police force of nearly 14,000 men, at a cost of 4,045,552 rupees—all Asiatics, except a small number of British officers.

The figures are extraordinarily high; first, because Burma is a comparatively new acquisition; secondly, the population is scattered, and thirdly, upper Burma on three sides is surrounded by extensive mountain tracts, occupied by wild and savage tribes. In an old colony like Ceylon, with 3,500,000 inhabitants, the military force numbers only 1,700 men (mostly British, however), with a voluntary corps of 1,200 men (mostly Asiatics), both together costing annually less than 2,000,000 rupees, while the police force consists of about 1,600 officers and men (of whom only 42 are Europeans), at an annual cost of less than 500,000 rupees. The experience of Ceylon indicates what with good government may be anticipated in the Philippines in the course of a decade or two.

As to the number of Americans who may be needed for the Philippine civil service the experience of the British will once more afford the safest indications. Take British India and the feudatory native states, with an area of 1,500,000 square miles and a population of 300,000,000, of which British India alone has an area of nearly 1,000,000 square miles and a population of over 230,000,000. "The whole of the higher executive and judicial work in this immense area and over this enormous population," says an eminent authority, Mr. Montague Kirkwood, "is performed by 1,000 British officials with the aid of natives on the average of one such European official to every 1,000 square miles of country and to every 230,000 inhabitants."

A similar work in Ceylon, with 25,000 square miles and 3,500,000 population is discharged by 71 British officials. * * * The conclusion is irresistible, that only a small number of Americans are needed as the organizing and directing brain of the civil administration of the Philippines; but these should be men of the highest qualifications, and to secure them, and at the same time good government, it is indispensable that they should be offered high compensation and appointments during good behavior and efficiency. On them, and practically on them alone, will devolve the fulfillment of our high obligations in the Philippines.

Again, on page 121, the commission gives this as their eighth conclusion:

The greatest care should be taken in the selection of officials for adminis-

tration. They should be men of the highest character and fitness, and partisan politics should be entirely separated from the government of the Philippines.

If the conclusions reached by these eminent commissioners, made on personal examination and after careful study and consideration, are true, it follows that economical and successful administration of these dependencies can be made only through competent appointees, selected and continued in accordance with the letter and spirit of this bill.

The most effective home institutions for the cultivation of the principles of religious and civil liberty are nonpartisan. The New England common schools, higher institutions of learning, towns, courts of all grades, churches, Army, and Navy, as a rule, are nonpartisan and each a most effective educator in these principles. The common school may well be denominated the primary school of religious and civil liberty.

In the school district persons liable to taxation meet on equal terms, choose the necessary officers, discuss the common needs of the youth of the district, make provision therefor, deal with subjects which touch closely their pockets and the dearest interests of their homes. The same is true, only as affecting a larger community, in the management of the affairs of the town. The instruction in all educational institutions and in the churches, the determination of property and personal rights in courts, and the organization and teaching in the Army and Navy are nonpartisan; and these institutions are most effective educators in these principles. They educate and develop the individual man; hence the community. They quicken and strengthen his power of thought, stimulate his ambition, show him that his rights of person and property are as fully protected as those of any class; that there is no class of nobility but those who think noble thoughts and perform noble deeds.

The product of our institutions in developing from the lowest stations in life the noblest, finest, highest specimens of individual manhood has been the wonder of the age and the amazement of mankind. This is the crowning glory of our free institutions. The nation must carry this work into and develop it in each of these dependencies, commencing with the primary or lower institutions of society, and there educate and develop the child, even the wayward child, into the noble man; the man into the honest, high-minded citizen and officer.

The great work can suitably be committed to the management, control, and development of only high-minded, unselfish, competent, efficient, nonpartisan appointees who, by security from unjust removal, are given time to comprehend fully the greatness and importance of the work and prosecute it to a successful issue. It is, under the resolution of April 20, 1898, not the work of a party, but the work of the nation, undertaken in the spirit of the good Samaritan, of the good neighbor, among the nations of the earth.

The intervention of this nation, on the terms announced in that resolution, for the relief of the Cubans is the first application of the doctrine of the good Samaritan, so far as I am aware, to national rights and duties. As there announced, the application is an unselfish intervention by this nation for the relief of a people suffering for centuries under "abhorrent conditions," robbed, stripped, wounded, half dead. In driving away the robber and granting relief to the Cubans, the Porto Ricans and Filipinos were found in like condition under the power of the same oppressor. Every noble instinct, as well as the spirit upon which the relief of the Cubans was undertaken, demands that like relief should be granted to them. The nurse who volunteers to relieve the half dead must be allowed some discretion in regard to the remedies to be applied, certainly until the sick is restored to reason and in some measure to health. Such is the teaching of the parable. The motive inciting to this action is the noblest known to the world. Its glory must not be dimmed by withdrawal before substantial relief has been given, religious and civil liberty established, nor by allowing selfish motives to dominate the nation's actions.

No worthy citizen of any political party can or will desire to have the nation's noble work in this behalf prove unsuccessful. They all are ready and will most heartily aid the President and heads of Departments in selecting and appointing high-minded, capable men to take charge of and carry forward the work. If this is done in the spirit of the good Samaritan, and in firm reliance on the guidance of the Father of men and nations, most surely the croakings of the pessimists will prove but idle words, born of their own doubts and fears, and there will be erected in each dependency a light-house of religious and civil liberty, which shall enlighten, elevate, and render contented and happy all the inhabitants thereof and afford help and encouragement to surrounding nations. To this end this measure, if enacted into law and obeyed in letter and spirit, will prove an important step in the right direction.

Unless further discussion of it is desired, I ask unanimous consent of the Senate that it may receive present and favorable consideration.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, before the matter is voted on, I desire to say that I wish I could share in the hope and expectation that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Ross] has, that the peaceful and perfect programme that he has marked out for what are called our new possessions could ever be realized. I do not expect it ever will be realized. The history of colonial possessions from the days of the Romans to the present time is a history of robbery, of peculation, of extravagant expenditure of money, of wrongdoing in high places, and of corruption broad and large. I do not think that the examples of to-day go to show that we are to be exempted from the monstrous evils that have always attended colonial rule.

The proconsular system of the Roman Empire and of the Roman Republic was the system that produced the abuses against which Cicero spoke to the senate, and, to use Macaulay's language, Tacitus thundered against the oppressor of Africa. The world has not changed. The jaunty way in which the American people embarked in this enterprise of colonial possessions and sent out its officials and its armies has certainly had a rebuke in what has been seen to happen in the last few months; and the Senator from Vermont and I will be older than we are now before the rule that has been laid down in all history is changed in our experience.

I do not object to the passage of the bill, but before it was passed I wanted to say this.

Mr. ALLISON. I hope the Senator from Vermont will not press that bill at this time. I yielded to the Senator with the view of giving him an opportunity of making some observations on the bill. After I have concluded the business I have in hand I shall not interfere with the further business of the Senate to-day. I now ask that the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill may be laid before the Senate, without interfering, of course, with whatever is the order of business this morning.

Mr. HOAR. I suggest to the Senator from Iowa that he allow the bill of the Senator from Vermont to be considered—indeed, it is before the Senate—and then that the Senator from Vermont give way to the conference report, because if the bill has to be called up anew a week or a fortnight hence it will take an hour or two then, whereas it might not take five minutes to finish it now.

Mr. ALLISON. The junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who has charge of what is known as the Philippine bill, which is the regular order by unanimous consent of the Senate, desires it to preserve that situation and position.

Mr. HOAR. That bill can be laid aside informally. I think the bill of the Senator from Vermont will not take much time.

Mr. ALLISON. If it will not take much time, that is another matter.

I ask now that whatever is the pending business before the Senate may be informally laid aside until I can present to the Senate the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside, and the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill be laid before the Senate. The Chair hears no objection, and that order is made.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. H. L. OVERSTREET, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

A bill (S. 906) to provide an American register for the steamer *Esther*, of New Orleans; and

A bill (S. 4291) to constitute Durham, N. C., a port of delivery in the customs collection district of Pamlico, and to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the act of Congress approved June 10, 1880, to said port.

The message also announced that the House had passed, with an amendment, the bill (S. 6) for the relief of James H. Latham; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

A bill (H. R. 4400) for the relief of Frank E. Kellogg, of the Sixth internal-revenue district of Missouri;

A bill (H. R. 6063) to amend chapter 2 of the laws passed by the first session of the Fifty-fifth Congress of the United States, being an act entitled "An act making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1898, and for other purposes," approved June 4, 1897;

A bill (H. R. 8765) for the relief of John C. Smith;

A bill (H. R. 8925) to authorize the detail of an officer of the retired list of the Army as adjutant-general of the District of Columbia militia;

A bill (H. R. 9389) to authorize the Seneca Telephone Company to construct and maintain lines in the Indian Territory;

A bill (H. R. 10921) granting to the Keokuk and Hamilton

Water Power Company right to construct and maintain wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill.; and

A bill (H. R. 11537) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in the appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900, and for prior years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution requesting the President to return to the House the bill of the House numbered H. R. 5136, granting an increase of pension to John M. Smith; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

POLICY REGARDING THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I desire to give notice at this time that on Friday morning, immediately after the routine morning business, I shall submit some few remarks on the joint resolution (S. R. 53) defining the policy of the United States relative to the Philippine Islands.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 9139) making appropriations to provide for the expenses of the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report of the conference committee will be read.

The Secretary proceeded to read the conference report, which appears in full in the proceedings of the Senate of yesterday, and continued the reading to the action of the committee on Senate amendment numbered 78, in relation to the public schools of the District of Columbia.

Mr. TELLER. I want to ask the chairman of the conference committee on the part of the Senate whether the committee made any change in the amount of money appropriated for the schools? We have not reached that part of the report yet, I believe. I inquire what is the amount of that appropriation?

Mr. ALLISON. I do not know that I can give the total appropriation at this minute.

Mr. TELLER. How does it compare with the appropriation as made by the Senate?

Mr. ALLISON. It stands practically as it was passed by the Senate. There is some little modification as to the wording of the provision.

Mr. TELLER. I want to say a word or two about the schools. Some things have come to my knowledge since the bill passed the Senate which, if I had known when it was pending in the Senate, I should have called attention to. There has been a general complaint for several years that there were not school facilities enough in the District, and the Committee on Appropriations have made an effort to secure facilities in that line. I understand that the complaint is that there was not sufficient appropriation to pay all the teachers. Last year eight young ladies taught school during the whole year without any compensation whatever, with the understanding, of course, that when there were vacancies in the pay force, they should have an opportunity to fill those places. Two of them have been thus provided for this year; but the district attorney held that the authorities had no right to employ those people without paying them. There are now six teachers employed at a salary of \$5 a month, which is practically teaching for nothing. I do not believe that either the Government of the United States or the people of this District are so poor that there is any necessity of teachers giving their services for nothing. If there is a demand, as there must be or they would not have these teachers, Congress ought to provide ample compensation for them. I do not know whether this bill does so or not.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me, what he now states was not brought to the attention of the committee.

Mr. TELLER. I never heard of it.

Mr. ALLISON. This bill increases the number of teachers in this District by 45.

Mr. TELLER. That may cover the point I had in view.

Mr. ALLISON. The way it was stated to us by those in authority was that this was ample provision for the increased growth of the schools. There are 45 more teachers provided for in this bill than are provided for in the present law.

Mr. TELLER. That may avoid the cause of complaint I thought I had. At least, it seemed to me that there had been some fault somewhere, for I know the Committee on Appropriations has been ready to make appropriations sufficiently large to cover the necessities of this District.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I think under the amendment the committee have agreed to, more definite information will be obtained by the next session of Congress in regard to all these matters. Without going into details, the Committee on the District of Columbia thought it was best to have a responsible head

to report on the complaints that were brought before that committee. We could not go into the matter fully at this session, but I think at the next session you will have laid before you, if this bill is carried out—and undoubtedly it will be—such details as will enable the committee to act intelligently.

I would prefer to have the members of the board of education appointed by the President.

Mr. TELLER. How are they to be appointed under the agreement made by the conference committee?

Mr. STEWART. By the District Commissioners; but after the investigation which has been had and the well-known views of Congress upon the subject, no doubt the District Commissioners will select the best persons that can be had, and I have every hope that it will be a success in accomplishing what the friends of the schools most desire.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the conference report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the report of the committee of conference?

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I hope the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, one of the conferees, will excuse me for asking him a question, because I can not tell from the published conference report what is really now the condition of the bill as to certain provisions. Does this bill strike out all of the charities under the control of churches except the St. Ann's Infant Asylum?

Mr. ALLISON. It does.

Mr. VEST. What amount is appropriated for that?

Mr. ALLISON. St. Ann's Infant Asylum?

Mr. VEST. Fifty-four hundred dollars, is it not?

Mr. ALLISON. I will find the amendment in a moment.

Mr. VEST. I know the superintendent of public charities asked for \$5,400 in his report, but I do not know the amount allowed in the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. ALLISON. For St. Ann's Infant Asylum I think the sum is \$5,400.

Mr. VEST. Yes. That is what he asked for. I should like to ask the Senator from Iowa if there is any question as to St. Ann's Infant Asylum being a Catholic institution, under the charge and control of the Catholic Church?

Mr. ALLISON. I think there is not any doubt about it.

Mr. VEST. I so understand it.

Mr. President, with no hope of defeating this report, and with no intention of attacking this appropriation for the infant asylum, of which I heartily approve, I want to make a few observations in regard to the extraordinary course as to this legislation.

In 1897, against my consent, Congress adopted the provision that from and after June 30, 1898, no appropriation in the District of Columbia should be made to any charity under the control and management of any church. It was stated then emphatically and reiterated that the tax money of the people of the United States should not be given to any school or charity that was under the management and control of any church, Protestant or Catholic. I should like to know, as a matter of legislative curiosity, if it is a proper term, how, in the face of that law, which is declared to be a general law by the superintendent of charities and of the Children's Guardians Board, this provision is retained in the bill, with the consent and approval of the board of charities and of the Board of Children's Guardians, giving \$5,400 of the tax money of the people of the United States to a Catholic school. I understand—I have been so informed, but I have not the honor to be a member of the Committee on Appropriations—that it is said in defense of this extraordinary provision that the people who manage the infant asylum, the Catholic nuns, can not possibly make Catholics out of infants under 7 years of age. In other words, the ground is abandoned that the tax money of the people shall not be taken for a denominational school, and the real reason is given, which I have always believed to exist, that these children were not to be made Catholics. That is the foundation and at the root of this whole matter.

I do not belong to any church, unfortunately, possibly, for myself. I am speaking now as a legislator, holding in trust the money of the people of the United States; and, more than that, I am speaking as a practical man and a reasonably honest man. I hate a hypocrite. I have had as bitter enemies as any man who ever lived, but I always respected one who struck above the belt, although he struck me almost a mortal blow. I despise a hypocrite who pretends one thing and does another, and is not honest in his statements or in his convictions. These people now who are pandering to this miserable, fanatic bigotry, and pretending that they are opposed to every denominational school, are advocating here \$5,400 to be taken out of the Treasury to be given to a Catholic school, and they know it to be one and do not dare to deny it. As I have said, their reason is, as they give it, that the children are of such tender age that they can not be made Catholics.

Mr. President, I have felt considerable interest in one of the Catholic schools in this city, not because it is a Catholic school, but because I thought it was doing a great and noble work. I look at this matter not as a member of any church, but as one intrusted with making laws for the people of the United States, including the people of this District, and I consider this subject, as I have had occasion to say before, exactly as if I were about to build a house or purchase a suit of clothes. I would get the best contractor and the best mechanic, and I would never ask his politics or his religion. I have been of the opinion, possibly a misapprehension, that every sort of charity and every sort of school that kept the boys and girls of the country out of the penitentiary, out of the houses of correction, out of the jails, and made of them honest, industrious, law-abiding citizens, ought to be encouraged, and that whenever it was done, if what was done inured to the benefit of public order and public decency, the Congress of the United States should encourage that work, and it should have it done in the best and most economical way. That has been my poor judgment upon the matter. If the Baptists or the Methodists or the Presbyterians or the Lutherans or the Catholics can do this work better and more cheaply than anybody else, I would pay them for it. I would not put a provision in here to take the tax money of the people and give it to a Catholic school upon the ground that they could not make Catholics out of those children because their age was too tender.

I was about to say in a plain way that I had become interested, without any ecclesiastical bias at all, in one institution in this city. That is the St. Joseph Orphan Asylum. It is a simple story, probably scarce worth the telling, yet I choose to state it. I live in the vicinity of P Street Market and Iowa circle, and in the spring and summer months, when Congress is in session, I have been in the habit of going to that market in the early hours of the morning in order to inhale the fragrance of the flowers, to see the country people come in with their products, and to enjoy the scene of activity, almost excitement, that prevails.

Several years ago I noticed on one of these early morning visits, while I was dealing with my butcher, two nuns standing in the market with a couple of little boys holding baskets. They spoke to nobody, they occupied always the same place; and I inquired of this gentleman with whom I was trading what was the meaning of these statues with their peculiar headdress, always standing, without a word, in the same place. He said they were nuns from the St. Joseph Orphan Asylum, and that two of them went on each market day to every market in this city, to give opportunity to the charitably disposed to make donations for the asylum; that they did not receive a dollar from the Government, and were dependent entirely upon those who were charitably disposed; that they relied upon that spiritual injunction "Faith, hope, and charity; and the greatest of these is charity." "And," said this tradesman, "a great many of the market people have stock left on hand which becomes stale if not sold, and we give it to these nuns to feed the hundred little boys, fatherless, motherless, homeless except for these good women."

I inquired and found the statement to be true. When the District appropriation bill came up, which was in a very short time, I proposed an amendment giving \$2,000 to the St. Joseph Orphan Asylum, the only charity in the city that received nothing from the Government. It was adopted. It became a law and remained for years until reduced to \$1,800 under the excited raid made upon all these charities in recent years. That is my interest, so far as I am personally concerned, in this question.

Mr. President, we are told by a gentleman who seems to be at the head of this whole business, Mr. Herbert Lewis, superintendent of charities and superintendent of the Board of Children's Guardians—and this is in his report for last year—that in his tour of inspection through these charitable institutions he discovered an altar at the St. Joseph Asylum, an altar at which was celebrated mass and at which these nuns knelt and asked assistance from God in the noble work they are carrying on. A Catholic altar! Beat your drum; fly your flag; double-shot your musket! A Catholic altar has been discovered absolutely in one of these institutions!

When Mr. Herbert Lewis's name was before the Senate for confirmation as superintendent of the Board of Children's Guardians, I opposed it, for I had reason to believe from information given to me that he was utterly opposed to anything that had the name of Catholic or the flavor of Catholicism about it. Take his reports, and you can read between the lines that he is a fanatic. I am told that he is honest. I have no doubt of it. There never was a fanatic yet who was not honest, and they have poured out more blood in the history of the world than everybody else put together. There is no doubt the Mohammedans are honest, one of whom is so vividly described in the Fire Worshippers as—

One of that saintly murderous brood,
To slaughter and the Koran given,
Who thinks through unbelievers' blood
Lies the directest road to Heaven.

The world is full of such people. They may not have swords in their hands, but they have them in their hearts, and they are honest. They believe that the way to save sinners is to take the Bible in one hand and the scimitar in the other. If not the Bible, to take the Koran. I do not sympathize with that sort of thing.

When Mr. Lewis's name was before the Senate for confirmation, I opposed it. It was toward the close of the session, and I held him up, as the saying is, while my friend the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McMILLAN] urged the confirmation, and repeatedly called upon me to withdraw opposition. I frankly stated to him, my reason for opposing Mr. Lewis's confirmation; that he might be the most honest man in the world, but he was not a man for this place; that we wanted a broad-minded man, a liberal man, and a man who would administer his office, one of the most delicate in the District, not with a view to his hostility to any church or his favoritism to any sect. At last Senator McMILLAN asked me to have an interview with Mr. Lewis in his committee room, that of the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I went with him as a personal favor.

Mr. Lewis stated to me in the presence of Senator McMILLAN that he had no hostility to the Catholic Church; that he would treat it as he would any other church. I told him frankly the reason why I opposed his confirmation, "because," I said, "I am opposed to any favoritism or any proscription. I am not a member of any church, but I want to keep these boys in this orphan asylum out of the jail and out of the house of correction and out of the penitentiary;" and he pledged himself solemnly that if confirmed he would administer this office fairly and equitably. Senator McMILLAN assured me that his promise could be relied upon, and he would be responsible for his conduct.

Now, take his reports. There is not one of them in which you can not read between the lines the animus that inspires him in all this work. He discovers a cross, a crucifix, an altar for saying mass, and he seems to regard it as a sort of treason against the United States. He seems to think that he has discovered a nest of scorpions plotting against the Government in secret. I do not attack this man personally. I would not know him if I should see him upon the street. I am talking of his official report, of his official action, as he has a right to talk of mine.

But, again, we are told that not a dollar of the tax money of the United States shall go to any of these institutions of any denomination, and Mr. Lewis argues in his report that it is a great economy to keep up this board of guardians, which may do some good work, but in my judgment it does very little. Yet what do the figures show? If there is any question about them, I can produce them, for I have examined his report this morning. There are, in round numbers, 100 orphan boys in the St. Joseph's Asylum. I take that for an example, as I am more familiar with it than any other. We have asked for the institution \$1,800 a year for boarding and clothing and educating these houseless little waifs. That is \$18 to the scholar. The report of the superintendent of the Board of Children's Guardians, Mr. Lewis, shows that in what he calls free homes—that is, where the children are farmed out and put with anybody who will take them, to be worked and educated after a fashion, and clothed and fed after a fashion—it costs \$14 a year. For what I do not know. He calls it administrative expenses. But there are a large number of these children who are boarded in different institutions; for instance, in the House of the Good Shepherd in Baltimore, where colored girls are placed who were leading irregular lives.

There is the Hart farm, as it is called, for colored people. His report shows that the expenses of the House of the Good Shepherd—I mean for clothing and feeding and educating, if there is any education there—amount to \$94 a year for every colored girl who goes into that school. That is the lowest that is paid by the Board of Children's Guardians to any of these institutions where they board their wards. On the Hart farm it costs \$185 a year for each one of the scholars or wards. Mr. Lewis asks for \$50,000 a year for the Board of Children's Guardians, and I suppose he has got it in this bill. The Senator from Iowa can tell us. The nuns at St. Joseph Asylum propose to clothe, feed, and educate daily these poor little orphans at \$18 a year. Mr. Lewis proposes to take them before the courts, have them condemned, in legal phrase, and he has two agents who go through the country to find somebody who is willing to take a boy and clothe and feed him and find the remuneration in his work.

Mr. President, I have lived long enough to distrust unselfish charity unless based on some religious feeling. I would rather put a poor, fatherless, motherless boy at Dotheboys Hall under Mr. Squeers than to put him out on a poor farm with strangers, to have his soul worked out of his body, in order that they can get back the cost of his clothing and food. I do not believe that you can have unadulterated and honest charity toward these poor little friendless creatures unless the higher instinct of religious duty is found as the incentive to that charitable action.

Mr. Lewis reports that the average cost in every one of the institutions where there are contracts to board his wards is \$112 a

year, and he says that there is a saving of at least \$75 by putting them in what he calls a free home. What does he mean by a free home? Does he mean a home that is free from restraint? Does he mean a home where there is personal liberty? He uses the phrase "a free home," and says there is a saving of \$75 by putting one of these poor children out on a poor farm, where he is worked by people who have possibly children of their own, and who naturally and inevitably will discriminate between this motherless and fatherless boy and their own offspring.

Let any Senator—it is not far from here—go down to St. Joseph's Asylum and look at those hundred little boys, well fed, well clothed, well educated, happy, and contented. Mr. Lewis says that after the appropriation was taken away they were not turned into the street. No; they were not turned into the street; but no thanks to him and the people who agree with him. They were not turned into the street because charitable people in this District came forward and donated enough to keep them where they are. I know one lady here who gives every year to these hundred little boys a suit of clothes apiece, besides other donations. I know a gentleman here who gives a certain portion of his income, divided amongst these charities. And they are not politicians; they are not pampering to votes; they do it because it is humane and right, and they look for their reward in the approval of their own consciences.

Does the fact that these charitable persons liberally donate to these institutions absolve the Government from its duty to pay a part at least of the expenses of clothing, feeding, and educating these children?

Mr. President, I challenge any Senator to take the report of Mr. Lewis, as superintendent of charities and superintendent of the Board of Children's Guardians—and he is at the head of both institutions and draws a salary for both—I challenge any Senator to take his own arithmetical statement and disprove my assertion as to the St. Joseph's Asylum, where 100 of these little boys are clothed, educated, and fed for \$18 apiece each year, when he, under his contracts made with other institutions, pays out \$112 for each one of these children, a difference of \$96.

Now, if I believed that the people who are attacking these charities because they belong to some particular church were sincere, I would not open my mouth in this Chamber in regard to the bill. But I go back now to the initial point, and I ask the question and I want some answer, or I brand this bill as a subterfuge and a fraud. I want to know how St. Ann's Orphan Asylum, notoriously and openly under the charge of the Catholic Church, receives \$5,400 a year of the people's tax money while the velvety ears and silken consciences of these reformers are torn and lacerated at the idea of giving \$1,800 a year to St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum?

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, only a word, and not in reply to the suggestions of the Senator from Missouri.

The appropriation for the St. Ann's Infant Asylum came to the Senate from the House of Representatives. It was inserted there by a vote of the House. It is said that there is no suitable place, at least none at the present time, where the children who are now supported at the St. Ann's Infant Asylum can be supported elsewhere. So they inserted that item, as we were informed, as an exceptional one.

We also inserted two items, one for St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum, \$1,800, and also a like sum for the Church Orphanage Association of St. John's Parish. I think all these three organizations are what might be regarded as denominational. The St. John's Church Orphanage is an Episcopal society, and they also take care of children from infancy to the age of 12 or 14 years. The St. Ann's Asylum takes little children in their infancy and provides for them until they are 6 or 7 years old, when they are most of them, I believe, turned over and cared for by the St. Joseph's Orphan Asylum.

The Committee on Appropriations inserted these items, believing that, like the St. Ann's Infant Asylum, they were exceptional in their character and nature; that is, that whatever may be the discussion or the different beliefs as respects sectarian appropriations, they were also exceptional in their nature, and we inserted these two items. But the House conferees refused to agree to them on the ground that they were not as exceptional as the item concerning St. Ann's Infant Asylum, that there are other places where these children can be cared for, and that if that were not true there is ample opportunity for benevolence here, and its exercise has been from year to year evidenced by the support of the St. Joseph's Asylum and other like institutions in this District.

It is a mistake to suppose that the charities in the District of Columbia—and there are many of them—are supported wholly or even partially by appropriations made by Congress. There are a great number of these charitable associations that receive nothing from Congress. The Methodists in the District have such an association. They have a large orphan asylum, where the orphans of that sect are cared for; and the Catholics have a great number of such institutions here that are not supported by Congress at

all. One of the best charities I know of is that of the Little Sisters of the Poor, in this District, which now has more than 200 inmates, white and colored, and is supported entirely by the voluntary contributions of the people.

So as respects the two items which the Senator has criticised, the conferees on the part of the Senate were unable to convince the conferees on the part of the House that they should remain in the bill; and as the two items involve only a small portion of the vast number of items in conference, we yielded.

That is all I have to say about the matter.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, I am not criticising our conferees. I think I understand their situation. I do not ask the Senator from Iowa to divulge what happened in the conference committee, but I should like to know why, if the principle is established that the tax money of the people shall not be taken for denominational schools, the appropriation of \$5,400 to St. Ann's Infant Asylum is justified by the fact that there is no other place for these infant children and that they are too young to receive the Catholic religion. That is the mystery with me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Illinois rise to the conference report?

Mr. MASON. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORAKER. What report is it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It is the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I had supposed that we would have had more notice when the conference report came up. I did not know that it was coming up. I am anxious for information upon the report. I have been trying to get it as well as I can from the printed report, which is now before me. I refer to the change in the law relative to the public schools of the District of Columbia.

I see on page 4 of the report that—

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "For officers: For 7 members of the board of education, at \$500 each, \$3,500; not more than \$1,750 of which shall be used during the first half of the fiscal year; 1 superintendent of public schools, \$4,000; 2 assistant superintendents, at \$2,500 each; 1 secretary, \$1,800; 1 clerk, \$1,400; 2 clerks, at \$1,000 each, and 1 messenger, \$720; in all, \$18,420."

Now, as I understand, that is to take the place of Senate amendment No. 79. For my part, as I am at present advised, from what I can see and learn, and I have been giving considerable attention to the public schools of Washington and I desire to say nothing but what will be to the advantage of the public schools, I can see no possible benefit in the intended change.

I should like to have this report go over until to-morrow, so that I can present such matters as I have prepared, or it is possible that I may be able to get such information as will enable me to support the conference report.

I am very anxious to show to the Senate, first, that there is the best public-school system in the United States here in Washington. I propose to show it by the comments and criticisms of the leading educators in this country, from New York and Boston, from Chicago and San Francisco. I can see no reason for taking the board, now composed, as I understand, of eleven citizens, appointed by the District Commissioners, and changing it to a petty salaried office at \$500 a year, when there is a larger board doing good work.

I am prepared to combat the proposition that there is anything like a failure in the public schools of the District of Columbia. I propose to do that, if I can have an opportunity, and if necessary I will do so now; but I prefer to have it go over, because if it does I might avoid taking the time of the Senate if I can see, or be permitted to see, any benefit which will come to the schools from this change.

I think we should teach in the public schools by precept and by example. I have no disposition to get into a debate with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. STEWART], who is not here at the present time. I consider the examination, to characterize it as mildly as possible, very unfair. I propose to show that the marking was unfair. They examined the boys and girls here ranging at about 15 years old, the first year in the high school, and the examination was not conducted in the fair, frank, and open way that would commend itself to the people and to the scholar. I have examined the papers. I have examined the report. I have examined the comments of the leading educators of this country upon the system employed in Washington. If this is a scheme to adopt some political plan to oust the present officers and managers of the schools of this city, I hope it may not be successful. I have visited every branch of the schools in this city, and I must say that I have never in my life visited schools where there is such uniform cleanliness, such splendid discipline, such apparent earnestness on the part of the teachers as there is found here in Washington.

I ask that the report may go over until to-morrow, that I may

submit the remarks that I have to submit in order, and I can save perhaps more time for the Senate in that way. Otherwise I shall proceed this afternoon, if the Senator from Iowa does not wish to have the report go over.

Mr. ALLISON. Mr. President, I should be very glad to accommodate the Senator from Illinois, but this is a conference report, and I do not see very well how he can reach the question he speaks of in any other way than to vote down the report.

So far as I know, no one—certainly no member of the Committee on Appropriations—has in any way in the debate intimated that our schools are not efficient, and I know very well there has been the highest encomium upon the schools by teachers in other cities, and perhaps in published reports. I myself have had many letters on that subject. There has been a practical difficulty in the management of the schools hitherto, and that difficulty lies in a divided responsibility. It has been claimed by the board of trustees and by others that the present board is practically without power, and it is believed by those who have investigated the subject that it is too large.

Now, the only thing that is done in this amendment is to change the name of the trustees from a board of trustees to a board of education and reduce their number to 7 instead of 11. Their appointment will be made by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as now. I do not see any practical benefit to be derived from the postponement of the report until another day. To accommodate the Senator we might have an understanding that we shall have a vote at 2 o'clock to-morrow. I will be willing to postpone the vote until that time.

Mr. MASON. I have no objection to that.

Mr. ALLISON. Unless we can have an understanding as to a particular hour when the vote shall be taken on the conference report, I shall be obliged to insist that we shall go on with the discussion at this time.

Mr. MASON. I have no objection to having an hour fixed, Mr. President. I may not take any of the time of the Senate to-morrow at all. I will not do so if I can avoid it.

Mr. FORAKER. Mr. President, I desire to call attention to a matter which I did not know about in time to remedy, if I had been able to do so, when the bill was under consideration.

Since it went to the conference committee it has come to my knowledge that the assistant teachers in the kindergartens in this city are being paid at the rate of only \$5 a month for the services they render. I speak of this now in order that I may call the attention of the committee of the Senate on the District of Columbia affairs to the matter, with a view to having it investigated, to see if there is not a wrong being done to these very faithful and very efficient workers in the course of instruction that they are placed in charge of.

In looking over this bill I see that very liberal salaries are being paid to the teachers. I do not complain of that at all. But when we get down to the appropriation made for kindergarten schools we have simply a lump sum of \$25,000 to provide for kindergarten instruction. I understand that there are only sixteen kindergarten schools in the city for white children and eight kindergarten schools in the city for colored children. It seems to me that with that kind of an appropriation there might be paid a more liberal salary to a young lady who has prepared herself by taking a course of instruction and who is devoting her life to that kind of important work. I do not know what explanation there is for it. I addressed a letter to the superintendent of schools, Mr. Powell, when I heard of it, asking him why it was, but until this time I have not had any answer.

Mr. MASON. What did you say the salary was?

Mr. FORAKER. Five dollars a month; \$60 a year. It seems to me to be a scandal and a shame and a reproach that anybody should be asked to engage in work that requires the preparation and labor and is of such importance as that for any such sum of money, and unless there is some explanation for it that I can not conceive of, I think it inexcusable, and it ought to be remedied. If we are to make this appropriation as a lump sum, as we have done, of course it passes beyond our power now to deal with it; but I trust the committee on the affairs of the District of Columbia will give it such attention as may be necessary to correct the wrong, if there is one, and it seems to me on the face of things there is.

Mr. ALLISON. I will say that the matter of the salaries of the teachers in the kindergarten schools here was not brought to the attention of the Committee on Appropriations in making appropriations for these schools. We appropriated for 1,245 teachers, the number of teachers that we supposed were necessary to carry on the teaching in the several schools. We provided specific salaries, the lowest salary being \$450 as the bill passed the Senate; and as it now will pass on the conference report, if the conference report is agreed to, the lowest salary paid will be \$425 per annum.

Two or three years ago the Committee on Appropriations were induced to make a special appropriation for kindergarten schools.

The first appropriation, I think, was \$12,000. It was not so much to pay for teachers as it was to rent rooms and provide in various ways the necessary material to be used in kindergarten schools. Until the Senator from Ohio, at my seat a moment ago, called my attention to the fact that these teachers are paid this insignificant sum, I did not know of the fact; but whatever the sum may be, it is too late to remedy it in this bill, as I understand.

Mr. FORAKER. I recognize that, and I did not rise with any view of remedying it, but only to call the Senator's attention to the matter.

Mr. ALLISON. Of course, if the committee's attention had been called to it, it might have been provided for.

Mr. MASON. Are there not assistants who are employed while they are studying to become kindergarten teachers?

Mr. FORAKER. In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois, I will state that the case I have in view is a case where a young lady took a regular course in a kindergarten school of instruction in the city of Boston, graduating therefrom after two years of training and study. Since that time she has taught a kindergarten—a private school of her own—in the State of Massachusetts. She then came here a year ago and took a position at \$5 a month, with the view of ultimately securing a position in kindergarten work in this city, where she would get something like an adequate salary. She now aspires to become a principal, where she would get, I think, \$40 a month, which is certainly little enough, considering the character of work the principals are required to do.

So that it is not the case of a young lady teaching as an assistant for the purpose of securing instruction, but it is the case of a skilled instructor in such work being required to accept a starvation salary that is a disgrace to the capital of the nation.

Mr. MASON. The Senator will understand I was only asking for information.

Mr. FORAKER. I so understand.

Mr. MASON. I quite agree with what the Senator has said about the salaries.

Mr. ALLISON. I wish to say that this whole matter of compensation of teachers and the management of the schools, subject to the limitations of these appropriations, are within the control of the eleven trustees and the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. Therefore whatever is necessary under this appropriation of \$25,000 will be amply within the power of the board of education to correct during the next school year, without the intervention of any statute or the interposition of any rules or regulations, other than can be made by the board of education.

Mr. FORAKER. I want to say, further, that the young lady from whom I got this information and to whom I referred made no complaint whatever. She came here voluntarily, she sought the position and accepted the service, but with a view, as I stated, to securing a promotion in due time by her faithful work. I make the complaint myself on my own motion. I could scarcely credit the statement when I heard it.

Mr. McMILLAN. Has the report of the conference committee gone over?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No. The question is, Will the Senate agree to the report of the conference committee?

Mr. MASON. I understood the Senator from Iowa to ask that we have the vote on the conference report at 2 o'clock to-morrow.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No request has been made.

Mr. ALLISON. I made no request, but I stated to the Senator that if there could be an understanding that at 2 o'clock to-morrow the vote should be taken on the report I would not object, but I see that other Senators desire to speak, and so I trust we shall go on at least until Senators can understand what the report contains and for such debate as may be required this afternoon.

I gave notice yesterday morning that I would call up this conference report, and I supposed every Senator had ample notice of that fact.

Mr. MASON. I will say to the Senator that I did not happen to be in my seat when he gave the notice. I had requested the Senator to let me know when the report would come up, so that I might have a chance to examine it and see if there had been any marked change in the matter. I say now that I do not know that I shall want to take the time of the Senate one moment upon the report; but I should like to have the matter go over until 2 o'clock to-morrow.

Mr. ALLISON. I ask unanimous consent that the vote may be taken on the report of the conference committee to-morrow at 2 o'clock.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the vote be taken on the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill to-morrow at 2 o'clock. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CIVIL OFFICES IN ALASKA, HAWAII, ETC.

Mr. McMILLAN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1929) to provide for eliminating cer-

tain grade crossings on the line of the Baltimore and Potomac Railroad Company in the city of Washington, D. C., and requiring said company to depress and elevate its tracks, and to enable it to relocate parts of its railroad therein.

Mr. ROSS. Senate bill 2000 was laid aside temporarily for the consideration of the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and, unless there is objection, I should like to have action upon the bill by the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. What is the request of the Senator?

Mr. ROSS. That the bill I have named be considered at the present time, unless there is objection or more discussion is desired upon it. The bill is really under consideration now. It was laid aside temporarily for the consideration of the conference report. The amendment reported by the committee has been read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the bill was before the Senate and that the amendment reported by the committee had been read.

Mr. ALDRICH. What is the bill? Let it be read by title.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The title will be stated.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 2000) regulating appointment to and removals from civil offices in outlying dependencies of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole, and the amendment reported by the committee will again be stated.

The Secretary read the amendment reported by the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That all appointments to civil offices made by the President or any head of a Department in Alaska, Hawaii, or any place brought within the jurisdiction of the United States by the recent treaty with Spain, shall be made irrespective of the political opinions of the persons appointed, and, so far as consistent with the proper performance of the duties of the office, in such a manner as to represent the entire country. In case of removal from any such office, whenever practicable, charges shall be made in writing and a copy thereof furnished to the accused, who shall be afforded reasonable opportunity to make answer thereto; and the President or head of a Department making the appointment may, wherever the public interest shall seem to require it, suspend the official pending hearing or investigation of such charges.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the committee, which has been read.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, when the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Ross] a little time ago asked for the consideration of this bill, I raised some objection, and it went over. I merely rise to-day to say that while I shall not object, as I desire to be very courteous to the Senator from Vermont, I regard it as an unnecessary and an absurd bill.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

Mr. VEST. Mr. President, from what committee does the bill come?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. From the Committee to Examine the Several Branches of the Civil Service.

Mr. ROSS. I will state that the report of the committee is unanimous.

Mr. VEST. It seems to be a very strange bill.

Mr. TURLEY. Mr. President, I am a member of the committee which reported the bill, and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and myself, the Senator from Vermont will remember, when the bill was in committee, asked, and we understood it was agreed to, that the caption of the bill be changed so as to strike out the words "outlying dependencies."

Mr. ROSS. There is provision for that in the amendment reported to the title of the bill.

Mr. TURLEY. I mean in the title of the bill.

Mr. ROSS. That will be in order after the bill shall have been passed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There is a proposed amendment to the title, which will be reached in time. The question now is on ordering the bill to be engrossed for a third reading.

Mr. VEST. I must confess, Mr. President, I do not understand this bill. I have never known of any such legislation. We are telling the President of the United States—true, it is a mere platitude—that he shall make appointments with a view to the interests of the whole country. I hardly think it is exactly our province to tell the Executive what his duty is about appointments. That matter is exclusively for him, with the approval of the Senate. The Constitution gives him the right to make appointments on the advice and consent of the Senate; and now we anticipate his action and say, if I understand it—a Senator was talking to me at the moment and perhaps I did not correctly catch the meaning of the bill—"Mr. President, you must make these appointments with a view to the best interests of the entire country." I am not representing the President, but I rather think he will do that, and rather think we are going out of our way to tell him he ought to do it. If we had a Democratic President, I should certainly think so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill be engrossed for a third reading?

Mr. MASON. Do I understand that the question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on ordering the bill to be engrossed for a third reading.

Mr. MASON. Then I ask to have it read in full.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be read in full as it has been amended.

The bill was read in full as amended, and ordered to be engrossed for a third reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is, Shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. MASON. I object to the further consideration of this bill at the present time. I have not had a chance to examine it, and this is the first time I have heard of it.

Mr. LODGE. It is too late now to object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair understands the bill is parliamentarily before the Senate and that an objection does not lie against it.

Mr. MASON. What is the entry in the Journal in regard to it?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill was laid before the Senate this morning on the request of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. ROSS] without objection; the Senator from Vermont made a speech upon it, and then it was laid aside.

Mr. GALLINGER. If I may be permitted, while I do not wish to obstruct this bill further than to vote against it, the Senator from Vermont asked distinctly in my presence that the bill be laid before the Senate that he might submit some remarks upon it. That is a customary thing to do, without proceeding to the consideration of a bill.

Mr. MASON. I did not understand that the bill had been taken up.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair was not presiding at the time it took place, but the Chair is informed—

Mr. ROSS. I asked that the bill be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Vermont asked unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill, that that consent was given, and that it was, by unanimous consent, laid aside in order that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. ALLISON] might present the conference report on the District of Columbia appropriation bill. Therefore, if that is a correct statement of the matter, the bill is before the Senate, and no objection will lie against it. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

Mr. SCOTT. I move that the bill be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. PENROSE. I second the motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia moves the indefinite postponement of the bill. [Putting the question.] By the sound, the "ayes" have it.

Mr. ROSS. I call for the yeas and nays on the motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS]. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. HANNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINS], who is absent.

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY]. I suggest to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY] that we might transfer our pairs, if agreeable to him, and then we may both vote.

Mr. CAFFERY. That meets my approval.

Mr. LODGE. I vote "nay."

Mr. CAFFERY. I vote "nay."

Mr. MARTIN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. CULLOM]. In his absence, I withhold my vote. I should vote "nay" if he were present.

Mr. MORGAN (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GEAR].

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY]. He being absent, I will withhold my vote.

Mr. PLATT of New York (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Idaho [Mr. HEITFELD]; but this question being one that is nonpolitical, I will take the liberty of voting, and will vote "nay."

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN]. If he were present, I should vote "yea."

Mr. TURLEY (when his name was called). I have a special pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PLATT], who is

necessarily absent. As I am informed he would vote "nay" on this question, I shall vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BACON. The junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], with whom I am paired, is absent, and so I withhold my vote. If he were present, I should vote "nay."

Mr. CULBERSON (after having voted in the negative). I desire to ask if the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. QUARLES] has voted?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair is informed that he has not voted.

Mr. CULBERSON. I have a general pair with that Senator, and therefore I withdraw my vote.

Mr. SPOONER. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. QUARLES] is absent acting upon a subcommittee of the Senate.

Mr. THURSTON. I understand that no quorum has voted. If that is the fact, I will take the liberty of voting, notwithstanding my pair. I vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 12, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—12.

Butler,	Hale,	McMillan,	Thurston,
Carter,	Hansbrough,	Scott,	Vest,
Gallinger,	Jones, Nev.	Sewell,	Wellington.

NAYS—28.

Aldrich,	Clark,	Lodge,	Platt, N. Y.
Allison,	Cockrell,	McComas,	Proctor,
Bard,	Foraker,	Mallory,	Ross,
Bate,	Frye,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Berry,	Harris,	Perkins,	Stewart,
Caffery,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Teller,
Chandler,	Kyle,	Pettus,	Turley.

NOT VOTING—46.

Allen,	Depew,	McBride,	Rawlins,
Bacon,	Elkins,	McCumber,	Shoup,
Baker,	Fairbanks,	McEnery,	Simon,
Beveridge,	Foster,	McLaurin,	Sullivan,
Burrows,	Gear,	Martin,	Taliaferro,
Chilton,	Hanna,	Mason,	Tillman,
Clay,	Hawley,	Money,	Turner,
Culbertson,	Heitfeld,	Morgan,	Warren,
Cullom,	Jones, Ark.	Penrose,	Wetmore,
Daniel,	Kean,	Platt, Conn.	Wolcott.
Davis,	Kenney,	Pritchard,	
Deboe,	Lindsay,	Quarles,	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. No quorum has voted. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Culbertson,	McComas,	Ross,
Allison,	Davis,	McMillan,	Sewell,
Bacon,	Fairbanks,	Mallory,	Shoup,
Bard,	Frye,	Mason,	Spooner,
Bate,	Gallinger,	Morgan,	Stewart,
Berry,	Hanna,	Nelson,	Teller,
Butler,	Hansbrough,	Penrose,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Harris,	Perkins,	Turley,
Carter,	Hoar,	Pettus,	Vest,
Chandler,	Jones, Ark.	Platt, N. Y.	Wellington.
Clark,	Kyle,	Proctor,	
Cockrell,	Lodge,	Quarles,	

Mr. CULBERSON. My colleague [Mr. CHILTON] is absent on account of illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Forty-six Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The roll will again be called on the motion to indefinitely postpone the bill.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE].

Mr. CAFFERY (when his name was called). Under the arrangement made with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] to transfer our respective pairs, I vote "nay."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Texas [Mr. CHILTON].

Mr. HANNA (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. RAWLINGS].

Mr. LODGE (when his name was called). I am paired with the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. CLAY]; but under the arrangement heretofore made with the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. CAFFERY], I transfer that pair to the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS] and vote "nay."

Mr. PENROSE (when his name was called). I again announce my pair with the Senator from Delaware [Mr. KENNEY], and withhold my vote.

Mr. THURSTON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILLMAN], but being anxious to assist in making a quorum I feel justified in voting. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McMILLAN (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LINDSAY], but under the circumstances I will let my vote in the affirmative stand.

The result was announced—yeas 10, nays 35; as follows:

	YEAS—10.		
Butler,	Hale,	Morgan,	Vest.
Carter,	Hansbrough,	Sewell,	
Gallinger,	McMillan,	Thurston,	

NAYS—35.			
Aldrich,	Culberson,	Kyle,	Proctor,
Allison,	Daniel,	Lodge,	Quarles,
Bard,	Fairbanks,	McComas,	Ross,
Bate,	Foraker,	Mallory,	Shoup,
Berry,	Frye,	Nelson,	Spooner,
Caffery,	Harris,	Perkins,	Stewart,
Chandler,	Hoar,	Pettigrew,	Teller,
Clark,	Jones, Ark.	Pettus,	Turley.
Cockrell,	Kean,	Platt, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—41.			
Allen,	Elkins,	McEnery,	Sullivan.
Bacon,	Foster,	McLaurin,	Taliaferro,
Baker,	Gear,	Martin,	Tillman,
Beveridge,	Hanna,	Mason,	Turner,
Burrows,	Hawley,	Money,	Warren,
Chilton,	Heitfeld,	Penrose,	Wellington,
Clay,	Jones, Nev.	Platt, Conn.	Wetmore,
Cullom,	Kenney,	Pritchard,	Wolcott.
Davis,	Lindsay,	Rawlins,	
Deboe,	McBride,	Scott,	
Depew,	McCumber,	Simon,	

So the Senate refused to postpone the bill indefinitely.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question recurs, Shall the bill be read a third time?

Mr. MASON. Mr. President, I desire to offer a few remarks in regard to the pending bill. The original bill as it was introduced provided:

That appointments to civil offices in Alaska, in Hawaii, in Guam, in Cuba, in Porto Rico, and in the Philippine Islands shall be made irrespective of the political affiliations of the appointees and in such manner as to represent the entire country and to give to each political party, as nearly as practicable, its proportionate share thereof.

Section 2 provided:

That such appointees shall not be removed from office except for incompetency, misconduct, inefficiency, or neglect of duty. Before removal the charges shall be made in writing and a copy thereof furnished to the accused, who shall be ordered to make answer thereto in writing, under oath, within a reasonable time, named in the order for answer.

Section 3 provided:

That if the accused shall fail to make answer within the time named the charges shall be taken as confessed. If the answer shall deny the charges, the President may refer the ascertainment of the truth of the charges to any impartial person, who shall, in the vicinity of the place where the office is located, hear the testimony and report the facts found thereon to the President.

This bill was introduced and referred to the committee in January of this year, and of course we all had constructive notice, at least, as to what the bill provided. We may not, of course many of us did not, have actual notice, but we certainly had constructive notice; and now, for the first time, the Senate's attention is called to the fact that all the three sections of the bill are stricken out; the author is heard in support of his bill as amended, and by some management which is not in keeping with the facts of the case, as I understood it, for I was in the Senate Chamber, we are forced to a vote upon this bill without discussion and without an opportunity of weighing its good or bad qualities. Yes, as the Senator from Pennsylvania suggests to me, it may be unconstitutional, and some of us constitutional lawyers have not had an opportunity to discover wherein it is or is not constitutional.

I wish, before I proceed to a discussion of the merits of this case, to call attention to the marked difference between legislation if it is introduced by one of our brother Senators or if it is introduced by some other brother Senator, not necessarily showing any special influence or advantage that any distinguished Senator may have over some experienced brother upon this floor, but to show how eager we are to take up and discuss in brief moments those things which seem to be satisfactory or will give us an opportunity to say to the world that we are in favor of civil service, for I propose to show before I sit down that there is no civil service here. It is a division of the spoils, and you gentlemen who have been preaching civil service, which is one of the living hypocrisies of the age, abandon your high plane of civil service and say, "No more examinations for fitness, but let us agree, boys, that whichever one of us wins we will divide the plums regardless of the man's ability, fitness, education, or training for the situation."

Mr. GALLINGER. And do it geographically.

Mr. MASON. Yes, and do it geographically. Now, I do not know whether or not our distinguished appointee in Cuba, Mr. Neely, was examined and gave the distance from the earth to the moon. One distinguished gentleman who was examined out West by the Civil Service Commission was asked how many Hessians came over to fight the Americans, and his answer was that a great many more came over than went back. [Laughter.] I think he received 90 per cent for the answer that he gave to that important question, when he was being examined to determine whether or not he could throw a letter into the Chicago box that was addressed to St. Louis. [Laughter.]

But, as I said before, I want to show the difference in treatment that this revolutionary bill has received and that which was received by the resolution I introduced, expressing sympathy for the struggling Boers. I introduced the resolution long before the appearance of Santa Claus last Christmas, long before you gentlemen went home or stayed in Washington to celebrate your Christmas holidays. I had supposed, by reason of the precedents established from the days of Monroe down to the days of Grover Cleveland, and the present Administration, too, that when I introduced a part of the Republican platform, which we adopted at St. Louis and which was adopted at the polls, from the beginning of the roll call, from the distinguished Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], who answers first, down to my younger and less experienced friend who answers last, every man in the Senate would pray for a moment when he could express his sympathy for the struggling Republic in South Africa.

I introduced that resolution. I had not the good fortune the distinguished Senator has who presented this of being able to report my own resolution. On the 6th day of December, as I remember, I sent it adrift into the cave of doom and despondency, into the very valley of the shadow of death, presided over by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. DAVIS] whom I now address.

Mr. President, I am sorry to address the Senate when there are so few present to hear these remarks of wisdom that fall from my lips so easily.

Mr. WELLINGTON. Would it not be well to have a quorum present? I raise the question of the presence of a quorum.

Mr. MASON. I am obliged to the Senator from Maryland.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. KEAN in the chair). The Senator from Maryland suggests the absence of a quorum. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Secretary called the roll; and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aldrich,	Culberson,	Kyle,	Quarles,
Bacon,	Fairbanks,	Lodge,	Ross,
Bard,	Foraker,	McComas,	Sewell,
Bate,	Frye,	McMillan,	Shoup,
Berry,	Gallinger,	Mallory,	Teller,
Butler,	Hanna,	Morgan,	Thurston,
Caffery,	Hansbrough,	Penrose,	Turley,
Carter,	Harris,	Perkins,	Wellington.
Chandler,	Hoar,	Pettus,	
Clark,	Kean,	Proctor,	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is not present.

Mr. PETTIGREW. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, May 16, 1900, at 12 o'clock m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, May 15, 1900.

The House met at 12 o'clock m. Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

RECALL OF BILL FROM THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President be requested to return to the House of Representatives the bill of the House 5161, granting an increase of pension to John M. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Without objection this request will be granted.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. I suppose that request is preferred in consequence of the death of the beneficiary?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Yes; the beneficiary died on the 4th of May.

Mr. LANHAM. I informed the Commissioner of Pensions of that fact myself.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS ASSOCIATION.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2931.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 2931) to incorporate the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes.

Whereas on the 22d of August, 1864, at Geneva, Switzerland, plenipotentiaries respectively representing Italy, Baden, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, France, Prussia, Saxony and Wurtemberg, and the Federal Council of Switzerland agreed upon ten articles of a treaty or convention for the purpose of mitigating the evils inseparable from war; of suppressing the needless severity and ameliorating the condition of soldiers wounded on the field of battle; and particularly providing, among other things, in effect, that persons employed in hospitals, and in affording relief to the sick and wounded,

and supplies for this purpose, shall be deemed neutral and entitled to protection; and that a distinctive and uniform flag shall be adopted for hospitals and ambulances, and convoys of sick and wounded, and an arm badge for individuals neutralized; and

Whereas said treaty has been ratified by all of said nations, and by others subsequently, to the number of forty-three or more, including the United States of America; and

Whereas a permanent organization is an agency needed in every nation to carry out the purposes of said treaty, and especially to secure supplies and to execute the humane objects contemplated by said treaty, with the power to adopt and use the distinctive flag and arm badge specified by said treaty in article 7, on which shall be the sign of the Red Cross, for the purpose of co-operating with the "Comité International de Secours aux Militaires Blessés" (International Committee of Relief for the Wounded in War); and

Whereas, in accordance with the requirements and customs of said international body, such an association, adopting and using said insignia, was formed in the city of Washington, D. C., in July, 1881, known as "The American National Association of the Red Cross," and reincorporated April 17, 1893, under the laws of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is believed that the importance of the work demands a reincorporation by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted, etc., That Clara Barton, George Kennan, Julian B. Hubbell, of the District of Columbia; Stephen E. Barton, of New York; William R. Day, of Ohio; Brainard H. Warner, Ellen Spencer Mussey, Alvey A. Adee, of the District of Columbia; Joseph Sheldon, of Connecticut; Charles F. Fairchild, William Letchworth, of New York City; Hilary A. Herbert, of Alabama; Joseph Gardner, Enola Lee Gardner, of Bedford, Ind.; John W. Noble, of St. Louis, Mo.; Richard Olney, of Boston, Mass.; Alexander W. Terrell, of Austin, Tex.; Leslie M. Shaw, Benjamin Tillinghast, of Iowa; Abraham C. Kaufman, of Charleston, S. C.; J. B. Vinet, of New Orleans, La.; George Gray, of Delaware; REDFIELD PROCTOR, of Vermont; GEORGE F. HOAR, of Massachusetts; CHARLES A. RUSSELL, of Connecticut; ROBERT W. MIERS, of Indiana, and their associates and successors, are hereby created a body corporate and politic in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That the name of this corporation shall be "The American National Red Cross," and by that name it shall have perpetual succession, with the power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity within the jurisdiction of the United States; to have and to hold such real and personal estate as shall be convenient and necessary to carry out the purposes of this corporation hereinafter set forth, such real estate to be limited to such quantity as may be necessary for official use or office buildings; to adopt a seal and the same to alter and destroy at pleasure; and to have the right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes hereinafter designated, as an emblem and badge, a Greek red cross on a white ground, as the same has been described in the treaty of Geneva, August 22, 1864, and adopted by the several nations acceding thereto; to ordain and establish by-laws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, and generally to do all such acts and things as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act and promote the purposes of said organization; and the corporation hereby created is designated as the organization which is authorized to act in matters of relief under said treaty.

SEC. 3. That the purposes of this corporation are and shall be—
First. To furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war, in accordance with the spirit and conditions of the conference of Geneva of October, 1863, and also of the treaty of the Red Cross, or the treaty of Geneva of August 22, 1864, to which the United States of America gave its adhesion on March 1, 1882.

Second. And for said purposes to perform all the duties devolved upon a national society by each nation which has acceded to said treaty.

Third. To succeed to all the rights which have been hitherto held and to all the duties which have heretofore been performed by the American National Red Cross as a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the United States relating to the District of Columbia, which organization is hereby dissolved.

Fourth. To act in matters of voluntary relief and in accordance with the military and naval authorities as a medium of communication between the people of the United States of America and their armies, and to act in such matters between similar national societies of other governments through the "Comité International de Secours" and the Government and the people and the armies of the United States of America.

Fifth. And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities.

Sixth. And to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same, and generally to promote measures of humanity and the welfare of mankind.

SEC. 4. That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person or association of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to wear or to display the sign of the Red Cross or any colorable imitation of said insignia, except in the service of the Government of the United States or by permission of the American National Red Cross, for the purpose of collecting, soliciting, or receiving money or material or for any person or organization to use the said symbol or name of the Red Cross, in doing, or in attempting to do, work similar to the American National Red Cross without permission as aforesaid, and the person or association so using the said Red Cross, or any colorable imitation thereof, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$500, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or both, for each and every offense. The fine so collected shall be paid to the American National Red Cross.

SEC. 5. That the said American National Red Cross shall report annually to the Secretary of State concerning its proceedings, and to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy when working with either or both of these Executive Departments of the Government.

SEC. 6. That Congress shall have the right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time.

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

On page 3, section 1, line 8, after the word "Indiana," insert: "George C. Boldt, William T. Wardell, of New York; Daniel Hastings, J. Wilkes O'Neill, of Pennsylvania; Thomas F. Walsh, of Colorado; John G. Sumner, of California; Charles C. Glover, Walter S. Woodward, Elizabeth Kibbey, Mabel T. Boardman, Walter Wyman, Sumner I. Kimball, of the District of Columbia; Edward Lowe, of Michigan."

On page 4, section 2, line 8, after the word "treaty," insert: "In accordance with article 7 of the treaty, the delivery of the brassard allowed for individuals neutralized in time of war shall be left to military authority."

On page 4, section 3, line 22, insert after the word "rights" the words "and property."

On page 5, section 4, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "colorable imitation of said insignia except in the service," and insert instead thereof the words "insignia colored in imitation thereof except by authority."

On page 6, section 4, line 8, after the word "Cross," insert the words "The

appointment of the chief medical officer shall not be made without the approval in writing of the Secretary of War."

On page 6 strike out section 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. That the said American National Red Cross shall, on the 1st day of January of each year, make and publish in at least two of the daily papers of the city of Washington, D. C., a full, complete, and itemized report of all receipts and expenditures of whatever kind, and of its proceedings during the preceding year, and shall also give such information concerning its transactions and affairs as the Secretary of State may from time to time require, and, in respect of all business and proceedings in which it may be concerned in connection with the War and Navy Departments of the Government, shall make reports to the Secretary of War and to the Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

Mr. RICHARDSON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman what committee has considered this bill, if any?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was considered by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It was before a subcommittee of that committee, which considered it carefully. Then it came before the full committee and was unanimously reported.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I should like to have an explanation by the gentleman, especially on certain points. As I understood the purport of the bill—which is quite long, and it is almost impossible to get the details as read by the Clerk, and I have not had time to examine it—it seems to me it provides for some penalties, pretty severe, and I do not understand how or where and in what forum these penalties are to be enforced on those persons who are found guilty of violating this proposed law. It seems to me that this is a very important measure to be considered by unanimous consent, without some time for its consideration. Did I understand that this penalty applies to those who may be charged with violations of this law in the States?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. It is unquestionably for operation in the States also.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the gentleman think that can be done? Does the gentleman think that can be done anywhere except in the District of Columbia and the Territories?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I do, Mr. Speaker. This bill is enforcing or carrying out a treaty which the United States is a party to with foreign nations. And let me say that this bill is practically the same bill as passed the House at least twice, I think, and also the Senate, and reached the President once, but from accident was not acted upon.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Does the gentleman say that this bill in that form ever passed the House?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I think so.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. It passed, then, when I was asleep, and it never will by unanimous consent.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. It was on the same principle.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I remember there was a bill that passed the House that you called the Red Cross Society. It was a District corporation. I remember objection was made against a general national incorporation, and to meet that objection they confined it to the District of Columbia. In that respect it is unobjectionable. To enter upon a course of national incorporation of objects of charity and benevolence is unnecessary, and nothing can better illustrate it than this bill. It undertakes to punish in every State of this Union what may be an innocent offense of wearing the insignia of a benevolent organization.

It then goes further and imposes a penalty; and, for the first time in the history of legislation, perhaps, the whole penalty shall go, not even to the informer, but to the corporation created by the laws of Congress. Heretofore the penalties have gone, first, to the informer, and then to the Government, and sometimes been divided between the two. Now, I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that this is an excellent charitable work, and every man in this House is willing to see it promoted and advanced; but I am not willing to violate sound principles of government in order to answer the demands of even charitably inclined people, and I hope he will let this stand over until it can be examined, because if the request for unanimous consent is pressed now, I shall be compelled to object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I must let it go over under the circumstances.

AMERICAN REGISTER FOR THE STEAMER ESTHER.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 906) to provide an American register for the steamer *Esther*, of New Orleans.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built steamer *Phoenix*, of Norway, purchased and wholly owned by an American citizen, and repaired by him, to be registered as a vessel of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to have some explanation of that bill, reserving the right to object. If the report is not too lengthy, I would like to hear it read.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the report will be read.

The report (by Mr. SPIGHT) was read, as follows:

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to whom was referred the bill (S. 906) to provide an American register for the steamer *Esther*, have considered the same and accompanying papers, and report as follows:

The Senate report fully states all the facts in the case, and your committee adopt the same as their report and report back the bill and recommend that it pass.

[Senate Report No. 624, Fifty-sixth Congress, first session.]

The Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 906) to provide an American register for the steamer *Esther*, have considered the same and accompanying papers and report as follows:

The *Esther* (formerly the Norwegian steamer *Phoenix*) is owned by William Adler, of New Orleans, La., a citizen of the United States, who purchased her at public auction while she lay a wreck on False Cape Bank, about 34 miles northeast of Cape Garcus, Central America, for the sum of \$2,600. The *Esther* (then *Phoenix*) was wrecked at the place named on November 1, 1898, abandoned by her crew, and was not floated until January 27, 1899, when she was raised by a wrecking crew sent from New Orleans by the purchaser.

The vessel was afterwards repaired at New Orleans, La., at an expense of \$22,396.41.

As this vessel could be registered under the provisions of the general law with regard to wrecked vessels by reason of the facts as stated, except for the fact that the wreck occurred outside of United States waters instead of within the same, your committee believe that this technical bar should be removed in this case, and accordingly report back the bill and recommend that it pass with an amendment striking out all of section 2, the subject-matter of which has been provided for in the general law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The bill was ordered to a third reading; and being read the third time, was passed.

On motion of Mr. SPIGHT a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. SPIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I now move that the House bill similar in character be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the House bill similar in character will be laid on the table. [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HENRY BIEDERBICK.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1938) to place Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell on the retired list of enlisted men of the Army.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, authorized to cause Henry Biederbick, Julius R. Frederick, Francis Long, and Maurice Connell, survivors of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition, to be enlisted as first-class sergeants of the Signal Corps of the Army and to place them on the retired list of the Army, with the pay and allowances, from and after the passage of this act, of first-class sergeants of the Signal Corps who have been retired after continuous active service of fifteen years.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I object to that.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I hope the gentleman will wait until an explanation is made.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. It is for placing men on the retired list, but out of pure politeness I will reserve the objection.

Mr. OVERSTREET. I think it is not exactly what the gentleman thinks it is. If he will withdraw his objection, I will explain it.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. OVERSTREET. This bill proposes to recognize the only remaining survivors of the Lady Franklin Bay expedition led by General Greely. There are five survivors of that expedition, of whom these are four, and General Greely makes the fifth. For the services which General Greely gave to the country he was rewarded by being promoted to a brigadier-generalship, and now occupies with credit and honor the position of Chief of the Signal Corps of the Army.

Mr. HULL. And he was promoted from captain.

Mr. OVERSTREET. Yes; he was promoted from a captain to a brigadier-general. These four remaining survivors, crippled in health because of hardships they endured, had long and honorable service in that line. This Government has been liberal in recognition of soldiers of different wars and of services rendered to the Government under trying conditions. This merely recognizes these men who have endured these hardships in serving their country in carrying the American flag to the farthest point north.

Of these Mr. Biederbick had served six years, and was dismissed for disability. Mr. Frederick served nine years, and was dismissed from the service for disability. Mr. Long has already served eighteen years, and was dismissed the service only on account of a reduction in the force. Mr. Connell, the fourth member of the survivors, has rendered ten years' services to the Government in the Army, and he, too, was dismissed on account of a reduction in the force.

It is true that this is a tardy recognition, but not lacking in attention by the War Department for the men in the service of the Government commensurate with their services.

The report is elaborate and explains how deeply interested the officials of the Government are who understand the hardships and services which these men have rendered. I trust the gentle-

man from Texas will appreciate that this is only a meager recognition in that it authorizes the President to retire them with the rank and pay of first sergeants only.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. They are not now in the service?

Mr. OVERSTREET. They are not now in the service because they were discharged for disabilities.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Two were discharged for disability, and the other two discharged. They are not now in the service, and yet you propose to retire gentlemen who were not in the service of the United States. That is carrying the retirement far beyond anything heretofore suggested.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to a suggestion?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. These four men are not in the service because of their breaking down in health.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is it; they are pensioners.

Mr. HULL. If they had been commissioned officers, they could have been retired. There is a provision that men must serve thirty years before they can be retired.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Every man in this country ought to be paid for services when he is working; then, when he is dismissed, the pay should stop.

Mr. HULL. I want to say that in the Committee on Military Affairs there were a large number who were opposed to retirement, as is the gentleman from Texas—

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. And yet I never could get a report from the Committee on Military Affairs upon that subject.

Mr. HULL (continuing). But they agreed that this was simply an act of justice to poor men whose disabilities are due to breaking down in the service.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Then it is a clear case for a pension. If these gentlemen rendered valuable services, whether valuable or not, if in a service which the Government had undertaken, they were crippled in their health, I would vote to pay them a pension.

Mr. OVERSTREET. There is no law whereby they can get a pension.

Mr. LOUD. Why not?

Mr. OVERSTREET. There is no provision for a pension under the law. Of course, they could be granted a pension by special act.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. If, with our liberal pension legislation, there is no law—

Mr. LOUD. If these men were discharged for disability, why should they not be pensioned if the disability was contracted in the service?

Mr. OVERSTREET. These men were transferred to this expedition, and contracted these disabilities while in the service of that expedition.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. I object.

SETTLERS ON ALGODONES GRANT, ARIZONA.

Mr. WILSON of Arizona. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill which I send to the desk.

The bill was read, as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11213) for relief of occupants of lands included in the Algodones grant, in Arizona.

Whereas the title to the lands in that section of the country in the county of Yuma and the Territory of Arizona, and included within the boundaries of the old Mexican land grant known as the Algodones grant, was tried by the United States Court of Private Land Claims, created for the settlement of titles to such grants, in the years 1895 and 1896; and

Whereas in the hearing of said contest before said court the alleged grantees under said grant were successful and their title thereto by said trial court confirmed, and immediately thereafter the said alleged grantees, for large and valuable considerations, sold to numbers of people, citizens and bona fide settlers on said lands, in tracts of less than 40 acres to each, and said settlers then believing that they had a bona fide title to said lands sold made lasting and valuable improvements and permanent homes thereon; and

Whereas the Government of the United States appealed said cause from the decision of said court below, and on said appeal the said decision of the said court below was reversed, and the title to said grant in said alleged grantees adjudged to be void, and that the said lands included within the boundaries of said grant, and sold as aforesaid, belonged to the United States; and if said settlers, citizens, and occupants of said lands who so purchased the same as aforesaid be not permitted to retain the same and pay the Government therefor they will be deprived of their homes at ruinous consequences to them: Therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That where such persons in good faith and for valuable considerations purchased from the grant claimants prior to May 23, 1898, portions of the land covered by the said grant, and have occupied and improved the same, such persons may, within six months from and after the passage of this act, or within three months after the said lands shall be restored to entry, purchase the same at the price of \$1.25 per acre, upon making proof of the facts required by this act under regulations to be provided by the Commissioner of the General Land Office and approved by the Secretary of the Interior, joint entries being admissible where two or more persons have purchased lands on the same 40-acre tract: *Provided,* That no one person shall purchase more than 40 acres, and no purchase shall be allowed for a less quantity than that contained in the smallest legal subdivision.

SEC. 2. That where persons duly qualified to make entry under the homestead or desert-land laws have occupied any of said lands with the intention of entering the same under the homestead or desert-land laws, such persons shall be allowed three months from and after the passage of this act, or

after the said lands shall be restored to entry, within which to make their entries, and the fact that such persons have improved or reclaimed such desert lands shall be no bar to their making such entries.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PAYNE. Reserving the right to object, I should like to hear an explanation of the bill. There is a long preamble to it, but I should like to hear what the committee says about it.

Mr. WILSON, of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Public Lands has made a report setting forth the facts in this case, and I believe the Clerk has the report at the desk. The land here in question belonged to the old Algodones grant, which was claimed by the grantees as coming from the Government of Mexico after the Mexican war. In 1854 an act was passed by which the surveyor-general was authorized to set apart this grant as public domain or leave it, as the title to the grant might leave it.

In 1890 there were three municipal townships in that grant in three ranges, which were reported as belonging to the grant made by the Mexican Government. Later on the grantees conveyed the grant to a company which began its improvement and sold lands to settlers. Later on the surveyor-general reported to the land department that he had discovered that the grant was a forgery; that it had been antedated and was therefore invalid. Under that report, in 1891, the matter was referred to the Court of Private Land Claims. In 1895 a contest of the claim was heard before that court. After a hearing of all the facts the court sustained the grant, declaring that it was valid. There the matter rested for more than a year, during which time the holders of the grant, the owners under the decree which had been made, sold small tracts of land, under a ditch which they had carried out over those tracts, to settlers, in 20 and 30 acre tracts to each individual and from 40 to 160 acre tracts farther down to other individuals.

The purchasers improved these tracts; they built homes upon them. Pending these proceedings an appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States, the decision of which hung fire for several years until, finally, when Judge McKenna was appointed he held with one side against the grants, and thus by a divided court the grant was declared to be void. Thus these particular settlers who had bought this land, paying fabulous prices for it to the grantees, were left without title; and the lands upon which they had built homes became lands subject to distribution to others.

The purpose of this bill is to permit individuals to pay to the Government the Government price for the particular lands which they bought in quantities of 40 acres or less; and, secondly, to permit those who bought lands in the grant to the extent of 40 acres, up to the limit of 160, to have the preference of entering under the homestead and desert-land laws. These are the purposes of the bill. The Land Department recommends it.

Mr. LACEY. I will ask my friend whether it is not true that if the grant which he has described had never existed at all, these settlers would have substantially the same rights that this bill proposes to accord them?

Mr. WILSON, of Arizona. Certainly they would, under the land laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection; and the bill was taken up, ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and it was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. KLEBERG, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering House bill (H. R. 11538) making appropriations for the Military Academy. Pending that motion, I ask that general debate may run not exceeding two hours—one hour to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER], and the other hour, if we desire to use it, to be controlled by myself, with leave to print for ten days to all gentlemen addressing the House during the general debate.

Mr. COX. I desire the attention of the chairman of the committee [Mr. HULL], who has charge of this bill. As I understood, the agreement in committee was that all those gentlemen who addressed the House should have liberty to print, and that members of the committee should have the same liberty. I made that request because I did not want to take up the time of the House.

Mr. HULL. According to my understanding I have submitted the request in the terms that the committee agreed to—that is, that all members addressing the House have leave for ten days to print. I assume, of course, that the gentleman from New York will certainly provide for members of the committee on his side such time as they may desire in preference to granting time to anybody else.

Mr. COX. All right.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to suggest to the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, and think he will not object to it, that permission to print should be granted to the members of the committee separately. It is true that each member may secure a short time, but also true that each member may not be able to secure even a few minutes, as there may be so much demand for time during the general debate. I hope therefore that the members of the committee will have a special opportunity, if they desire to avail themselves of it.

Mr. COX. That is right.

Mr. SULZER. There is no opposition, Mr. Chairman, to the bill at all. It is reported unanimously from the Committee on Military Affairs, and it was agreed in the committee that we should have one hour on each side for discussion.

So far as my colleague from Tennessee is concerned and my friend from Texas, they shall have all the time they may desire.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will submit the request to the House. Is there objection to the request that debate be limited as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

The question being taken on the motion of Mr. HULL, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. O'GRADY in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the Military Academy appropriation bill, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first formal reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, the report on this bill, which is accessible to the members of the House, shows fully all of the items considered by the committee, and which are incorporated in the bill, as well as the few changes which have been made in the amounts and methods of appropriation as compared with bills which have heretofore been passed on this subject.

I assume that no point of order can lie against anything in the bill except possibly with reference to two small items of increase of salary which I will explain when reached—that is the salary of certain subordinate officers, trifling amounts, and which the committee regarded as entirely justifiable in view of the facts laid before them.

The bill carries about \$644,000, which is an increase over the preceding year of some \$69,000, all of which increase has been accounted for and is fully stated in the report. All of these items of increase are set forth in the Book of Estimates, excepting two, which came to the committee after the Book of Estimates had been submitted and which consequently do not appear in the Book of Estimates on which the bill is based.

The other items in which changes appear in the bill are such as will better be considered under the five-minute rule, and I therefore reserve the remainder of the time allotted to this side of the House.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, in the consideration of the pending bill I ask that the article I send to the desk may be read by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

[From the Washington Post, April 3, 1900.]

WARNED AWAY FROM CUBA—SECRETARY ROOT SAYS THE ISLAND IS NO PLACE FOR MONEYLESS AMERICANS.

The War Department has been obliged to sound a note of warning to restrain overconfident Americans from flocking into Cuba without resources. General Wood has made this a matter of special representations to Secretary Root. He reports that there are quite a number of such Americans completely stranded in Cuba whom he is unable to relieve. His suggestion was that the Department authorize him to ship them back to the United States on the Army transports, but so far Secretary Root has not been able to see how he can do this.

According to the advices received by the Department, Cuba is no place for a man without money. With some capital there is large opportunity for returns, but otherwise even willing workmen and clerks can not secure employment and must soon come to grief. Secretary Root mentioned the fate of some of the Americans who had gone to Cuba as parts of alleged "colonies" as particularly hard, and if it shall appear proper to extend relief at all it may be that he will authorize those who are now suffering in these colonies to be brought home in the transports.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not doubt that the Clerk meant well, but it was utterly impossible to hear him this side of the desk.

This document, I will state for the benefit of those who did not have the opportunity of hearing it, is a warning to the public generally by the War Department against poor men going into Cuba for the purpose of providing for themselves or their families in that new possession of ours, and is a warning generally for men without money to keep away from there.

That notice is the third note of warning that the Government has sounded with regard to these islands.

A year or more ago I saw similar notices having reference to Porto Rico and Hawaii, and only the urgent political necessity

for concealing the truth about the Philippines has, I fancy, kept the authorities from hoisting the danger signal there also.

This notice says that "Cuba is no place for a man without money." So also said the warnings about Porto Rico and Hawaii.

But all these islands are said to present excellent opportunities for exploitation by capitalists, and the trusts are urged to go there and garner the millions which our military expenditures of hundreds of millions have made their possible and easy prey. The man without money is advised to keep away. The millionaire is invited to go in and gain more millions.

To those that have shall more be given—if they are allied to the trusts and under the protection of the Republican party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Then, Mr. Speaker, it resolves itself down to this: That the blood and the treasure of the American people have been spent solely for the benefit of capital. Poor men, "men without money," to use the phrase of the War Department, are distinctly advised that these boasted "new possessions" offer them no asylum.

"New possessions!" What a hateful and un-American phrase that is to use in a free, federated republic! It suggests the idea of property and its owner, or, when referring to the affairs of government, vassal and ruler, an idea which was utterly repugnant to Washington, Adams, and Jefferson, and which is a distinct repudiation of our Declaration of Independence and the Constitution which was intended to make it good.

There are sugar lands and coffee plantations in these "possessions" that must be cultivated, but conditions are such that only capital and, as a matter of fact, organized capital can undertake the enterprise.

Mark the contrast, sir, between these published warnings and the notices that followed the purchase of the Louisiana Territory.

Then poor men were urged to go into the new territory, which was frankly made a part of the United States and given the rights of all other parts, and invited to make free homes on its fertile lands.

They took that advice, Mr. Speaker, and magnificent, prosperous, free commonwealths erected in that territory to-day sing psalms of praise to the wisdom of Jefferson.

There are other lines of contrast in these territorial acquisitions worthy your attention. The Louisiana purchase was enlightened, reasonable, and desirable expansion, or natural growth, by the acquisition of a salubrious, contiguous, and fertile territory, which was practically uninhabited. The other is the conquest of islands scattered from this to the other side of the world and already so densely populated that their people are fighting for a bare existence and content themselves with a wage which would mean starvation to American workmen.

It is a mercy to workmen that only the rich are bidden into the McKinley acquisition.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it appears to me that these conquests were as unnecessary from a material and commercial point of view as they are unwise politically. If we properly develop our own great continental domain, we have our work cut out for a long time to come.

There is no reason yet why our workmen should seek employment in fever-breeding Tropics, nor American capital hunt investments in regions where malaria and revolutions are in the blood.

There is still another striking contrast between the Jefferson style of expansion and that of the present Administration, to which I invite the attention of the House.

Everybody knows that it is much easier for the average man to make a living in a sparsely settled country than in regions overpopulated. Everybody knows that in Europe and in Asia, where there are congested populations, the wage scale is much lower than in America.

The reason for it is not hard to find. The jobs are too few compared with the number of men who want them. The demand for labor is limited and the supply of it practically unlimited.

The result is, of course, a death-breeding competition, which makes an inviting field for the operation of capital, but is not so alluring to the man whose muscle guides the machine and whose sweat moistens the soil.

The population of Cuba is about 38, that of the Philippines about 80, and that of Porto Rico 250 to the square mile. In Cuba a poor man, notwithstanding this warning of the War Department, might live, although he could not prosper. Colonies of Americans who went there just after the war have already broken up in despair and returned to this country. In the Philippines he could keep body and soul together until the all-pervading malaria relieved him from his troubles; but in Porto Rico, where there are 250 people on every square mile of territory struggling for the right to breathe and go naked, he would surely meet a speedy and merciful death by starvation.

Now, how is it in this country, Mr. Speaker? In Texas, for example, we have 266,000 square miles of rich and fruitful lands, with a beautiful and healthful climate and a population of only 3,000,000, or about 11 people to the square mile.

Texas produces about one-fourth of the world's counted cotton supply, and only a modest fraction of her lands is in cultivation. She is exporting wheat and flour to France and England, and her grain fields are so far apart that the community thrasher is not always relied upon. Her flocks crowd the markets of Omaha, Kansas City, St. Louis, and Chicago, and her flock masters still rely upon the indigenous grasses.

Texas invites those who find conditions hard elsewhere to come there and prosper.

A free, prosperous, and lightly-taxed State in this country offers a hundredfold greater opportunities than can be found in any tropics anywhere on earth, greater opportunities both to capital and labor.

I confidently invite you to contrast Texas with any of your so-called "new possessions."

In Texas there is plenty of room for people and no limit to opportunities for capital.

I want to say in passing, Mr. Chairman, that the invitation I have just extended to everybody to come to Texas and prosper and be happy was not meant to embrace the carpetbagger, who appears to have a new lease of life right now.

I extend an invitation to all honest men, but we bar the carpetbagger. We have had an experience with him in the South, and we have recently had developments in Cuba which show that the character which he displayed twenty-five or thirty years ago has lost none of its objectionable features while he has been in retirement. [Laughter.] Spain doubtless was corrupt, but I want to say that my observation of the carpetbagger in the South confirms me in the belief that, however corrupt Spain may have been, however ingenious her officials may have been in the robbery of the Cubans, they are not in it with the carpetbagger. When you turn the carpetbaggers loose on the Cubans they will see an exhibit of stealing as a fine art, and it will show that Spain is two hundred years behind the procession. [Laughter.]

To promote the mad policy of imperialism a deliberate effort has been made, indeed I may say is now being made, to debauch the consciences and minds of the people of the South.

They are being seduced by promises of increased markets for their cotton and cotton goods. But while these ridiculous and false promises are being held out to them, they are not told that there is a possibility that their great staple crop, cotton, may be menaced by a competitive article from the Asiatic colonies which it is proposed to set up as soon as we have subjugated or exterminated the Filipinos. It will not do to say, as some gentlemen even in the South say, that the Tropics can not produce cotton. Altitude will overcome the climatic obstacles of latitude, Mr. Chairman.

I have seen wheat and other small grain supposed to belong exclusively to the Northern countries growing and maturing beautifully in regions to the south of the Tropic of Cancer. I have myself seen cotton growing in the Tropics. I know that it can be produced there.

But there is other evidence upon this point.

Prof. Dean C. Worcester, who spent three years or more in the Philippines as a student, and who has revisited the islands as a commissioner from Mr. McKinley, says that they can produce cotton. I had this from his own lips. In reply to my question he said that practically all the islands could produce cotton; that on the island of Luzon it is being produced now and formerly was produced in great quantities and woven into cloth for the use of the people.

Foreman, another Philippine traveler and historian, confirms what Professor Worcester said to me. He says:

Long-staple cotton was formerly extensively cultivated in the province of Llocos Norte, whence many years ago large quantities of good cotton stuffs were exported. This industry still exists.

In a small way, as Professor Worcester assured me, the people of northern Luzon still raise cotton, which they spin and weave into cloth for local consumption. This industry has been kept alive in defiance of the exactions of the Spanish tobacco monopoly, which for years has sought to compel the people to devote their lands to tobacco, to the exclusion of all other crops except rice.

In Fiske's Story of the Philippines we are told that "It only needs enterprise and common sense to make cotton raising a valuable industry in northern Luzon."

The weight of evidence then goes to show, Mr. Chairman, that these islands have produced cotton, that they do produce cotton, and that they may become dangerous competitors of our Southern planters.

But is there no danger to the manufacturer?

I think there is, and a very serious danger.

Bishop Potter, of New York, was recently in the Philippine Islands, and when he came back he gave a number of very interesting interviews to the newspapers.

Among other things he is reported to have said I found this statement:

Bishop Potter spoke highly of the native industry of the Filipinos, telling of seeing 450 native boys and girls at work in a Manila cotton factory. They

learn to manipulate a loom in one-fourth the time a European requires, according to the testimony of the superintendent.

Adult Filipinos work for from 15 to 25 cents a day.

What these expert children, boys and girls, are permitted to earn is an interesting question for the cotton operatives of Fall River, Providence, and the South.

But, sir, the danger from the Filipinos, who are indolent and unambitious, is a trifle to that which menaces us in another quarter of this mysterious Orient. Chinese statistics are hard to get and not always reliable. Yet well-informed business men reckon the Chinese cotton crop to equal about two and a half million bales of the American product. It may be much more. It can hardly be less.

We may entertain contempt for the Filipino mill hand, but the case is quite different when we come to China. A considerable section of China possesses the climatic conditions which are conducive to the spinning and weaving of cotton.

The Chinese are a cotton clothed people, and if they use, as they are estimated to do, 5 pounds a head, there may be a large demand for cotton fabrics, as it would take about 4,000,000 bales of American cotton to supply the Chinese at that rate, if we could be sure that we should supply them. They are now clothed to the extent of 80 per cent of their number or more in hand-made fabrics, spun on wheels and woven on hand looms from cotton now produced in China. Now, that is unquestionably the best preparation for factory operatives. That habit of spinning and weaving by hand is exactly what qualifies the French Canadians, who now number more than any other class in the New England cotton factories. Therefore, whenever China enters largely into the field of modern industry, the considerable number of cotton factories now existing will be extended faster than they have been in the South, and these intelligent, handy, Chinese operatives will not only make their own cotton goods, but will be in a position to supply the outside population throughout the world with cotton goods exported.

The argument for empire is the argument of greed. It is the lust for gold. It is nothing but downright hypocrisy and falsehood for us to put it on any other ground. A few missionaries may be inspired by a desire to educate and civilize the oriental savages, but with the other ninety and nine there is no interest in them but that which is symbolized by the dollar-mark. The men who are repudiating the Declaration of Independence and laughing at the Constitution as out of date have no motive higher than greed.

The people who run the criminal-aggression machine are exclusively men occupied in large operations. They are commercial bummers. Their purpose is to secure contracts for large works employing cheap labor in foreign countries. They do not consider the American who labors. They are not concerned about the competition of low-priced labor in the production of cotton, tobacco, sugar, and rice. They look to dividends only. Does anyone believe that when they can employ Filipino children in the spinning and weaving of cotton for a few cents a day that it will not be done?

Labor organizations have done a great deal to elevate the wage scale in this country and to improve the standard of living, but they are not powerful enough to revolutionize the social and economic conditions that obtain in the Philippines.

When the Chinaman, as he surely will, and the Filipino, as he inevitably must under the guidance of American trusts, begins to put the produce of the oriental factories into the markets of the world in competition with our own factories, the laboring man of the United States will realize what the empire means.

I have already spoken of the population of the Philippine Islands. Moya y Jimenez, an eminent Spanish authority, said that the population was more than 10,000,000 in 1877, and that it was increasing at the rate of 2 per cent per year.

The wars of the Spaniards and the "benevolent assimilation" processes of our own Government have perhaps held the population level during the last twenty years. Certainly there are more than 70 and there may be 100 people to the square mile.

This leaves no room for an American settler, if one were so foolish as to want to go. But the climate forbids settlement by white Americans.

When Professor Worcester was merely a student, before he came under the mind and conscience paralyzing influence of Presidential patronage, he published a description of the islands, the climate, and the people of the Philippines, from which I will make a few extracts.

On page 61 of his very entertaining book, in a general description of the islands, he says:

It is hardly possible to make a general statement as to the best season for a trip through the provinces, for this varies with the locality to be visited. The Spaniards epigrammatically describe the seasons as consisting of "seis meses de polvo, seis meses de lodo, seis meses de todo" (six months of dust, six months of mud, six months of everything), but when it is dusty in one place it may be muddy in another. While we were in Marinduque, in May, 1888, the ground was so parched that one could thrust a hand into the cracks,

yet we looked just across the strait to Mindoro and watched the storm clouds gather and burst day after day.

And on page 64 he has this to say about the climate:

Numerous contradictory statements have recently appeared as to the climate and its effect on white men. One author calls it "lovely;" another is equally positive that it is "deadly;" a third assures us that "for a tropical climate that of the islands may be considered healthful for people of the white race;" while a fourth asserts that "the climate of the Philippines is particularly severe and unhealthy," and backs his assertion by showing that it killed 25 per cent of the Spanish troops sent out in 1896 within fifteen months of their arrival.

With the exception of the first, all are right, but I confess that I can not see how anyone can honestly use the word "lovely" in this connection. There are some localities in which it might perhaps apply during two or three months of the twelve, although I have never yet experienced, at sea level, a day when a white man could endure severe physical exertion without suffering from the heat.

Briefly stated, the facts are as follows: If one is permanently situated in a good locality, where he can secure suitable food and good drinking water, if he is scrupulously careful as to his diet, avoids excesses of all kinds, keeps out of the sun in the middle of the day, and refrains from severe and long-continued physical exertion, he is likely to remain well, always supposing that he is fortunate enough to escape malarial infection. I knew an old Spaniard who at the end of a residence of thirty-nine years in the Philippines was able to boast that he had not been ill a day. He had always been so situated that he could take care of himself, and he had done it.

But how is it with the explorer, the engineer, the man who would fell timber, cultivate new ground, or in some other way develop the latent resources of the country? That, as Mr. Kipling so often remarks, is another story. It is likewise a very different story, and after traveling in the provinces for three and a half years I think I may fairly claim to know it.

And as to the healthfulness of the islands he says, on page 66:

Our work sometimes made it necessary for us to visit localities where fever was known to be prevalent, and we came to look upon it as one of the necessary evils of existence. A temperature of 100.5° was not comfortable, but it did not occasion us any alarm. After our third trip to Mindoro the temperature of one member of our party touched that mark on ten successive days; and I may add that although I have visited Mindoro three times with other white men, and have each time had considerable numbers of natives in my employ, I have never yet escaped malaria, nor was any other member of the party, white or native, more fortunate.

The traveler soon learns to recognize several types of fever: one recurs every third day, another every second day, and a third daily. If promptly and energetically taken in hand any of these may be shaken off. But the much-dreaded *calentura perniciosa* is a very malignant disease, running its course in a few hours, and frequently terminating with black vomit and death. Fortunately "la perniciosa" is very local in its occurrence, and the places where it is known to exist are shunned by natives and whites alike.

This account of what a white man may expect in the Philippines proves the wisdom and the mercy of the policy of the Administration in warning "men without money" to keep away from the islands. They must be left to the capitalists, who can and will use native and Chinese cheap labor.

On page 67 he sounds this awful warning to Americans who might be foolishly thinking of leaving a healthful, temperate climate for the disease-breeding Tropics:

It is unfortunately true that the climate of the Philippines is especially severe in its effect on white women and children. It is very doubtful, in my judgment, if many successive generations of European or American children could be reared there.

On page 68 he says:

Smallpox is always present—

And that—

Cholera, while infrequent, can not, when once started, be controlled.

He also says that—

Leprosy occurs, but is not common.

And adds:

There is a great deal of biri-biri in Balabac, and I have seen it in Mindoro.

On page 123, in the chapter on Balabac, Cagayan, Sulu, Mindanao, and Basilan, our author says of Balabac:

The island is extremely unhealthy. Fever of a virulent type is very common, and so is that disgusting disease biri-biri. An appointment as governor of Balabac is not ordinarily regarded as a compliment. In fact, it is quite generally understood that this honor is, as a rule, reserved for some one who could be conveniently spared should he be provisionally removed. This was, at all events, the view of the case taken by the poor, fever-marked governor who came off to our steamer. His face and neck were covered with the evil brown spots that are a sure sign of bad malarial poisoning, and he openly avowed his belief that he had been sent to the accursed place to die. We at first thought he had a very bad case of "funk," but when, a few minutes later, marines from one of the gunboats were brought out to our ship for removal to hospital and we saw that they were swollen into utter shapelessness with biri-biri, we decided to drop Balabac from our list of islands to be visited.

In describing an incident in the career of General Weyler, which occurred while he was on the island of Mindanao, Mr. Worcester says (page 126):

For some reason, best known to himself, he saw fit to send an expedition against the Moros. It was very broadly hinted by his countrymen that he had an itching for the rank of marshal, and hoped to win it. Whatever the cause, all the available forces in the archipelago were concentrated and marched into the Mindanao forest. An officer who accompanied the expedition told me that the enemy simply ran away, and they were never able to overtake them, while 80 per cent of their own men were disabled by starvation and fever. Although the starvation might have been avoided, it is tolerably certain that the fever was inevitable.

The mortality was certainly terrible. We saw the wreck of the expedition come back, and in spite of the fact that the priests from all the towns near Zamboanga were called in, they could not shrive the soldiers as fast as they died. Sick men were sent away by the shipload. Meanwhile, Weyler was directing operations from a very safe distance, spending much of his time on a dispatch boat.

Later on in the same chapter (page 139) he pays this tribute to the salubrity of the island:

On our arrival at Ayala we began our collecting at once, but found ourselves at some distance from the forest, and tramping seemed to come hard. We had foolishly overworked, and needlessly exposed ourselves, in Palawan, and the day of reckoning had arrived promptly, as it usually does in such a climate. The doctor came down with dysentery, and Moseley with fever, while Bourns and I soon became so disabled by unhealed cuts and ulcers that we could no longer get to the woods. Mateo held out longest, but finally he, too, had a touch of fever.

In the island of Mindanao he had the opportunity to personally observe the hideous tricks of that most loathsome disease, leprosy, and thus describes a boatman whom he had occasion to employ (page 141):

When we were half a mile from shore I happened to glance at the up-turned bottoms of his feet. To my horror, I noted that I could see the bare bones of one, while all the toes were gone from the other. A moment later the rag dropped from one of his hands. Joints were missing from several of his fingers. The man was a leper. It is needless to say that I kept in my part of the boat.

But after all, Mr. Speaker, it is not the study of economic conditions in these islands which so much absorbs our attention as the study of the people themselves.

The pay roll of the United States Government contains a great many names. No doubt many unworthy and interesting people are living upon the taxpayers of this country.

But in all that long list of names none excite more interest than those of our own and only Sultan of Jolo and his datos. We have a solemn treaty with this Sultan and his datos, a treaty in which we pledge this Government to protect them in the exercise of their religion and customs, social and domestic.

In consideration of this guaranty of the sanctity of the harem and safety of the mutilated guardians of the Sultan's zenanas, His Highness agreed to acknowledge the sovereignty of the United States. Truly a great concession on the part of this potentate of the East, whose wives and concubines rival in number those of the great King Solomon himself.

It is a triumph of diplomacy, rivaling in brilliancy and importance the victory of Manila, of which it is a glorious result.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to invite the attention of the House briefly to a description of the character of some of our new fellow-citizens, and I want specially to call your attention to the fact that I am describing not only one of your fellow-citizens, but one who is a fellow-official as well, who is upon the pay roll of the United States Government. From that same excellent and entertaining work, Professor Worcester's volume upon the Philippine Islands, I have extracted this account of the life and character of the Dato Pedro, one of the officials, master at arms, perhaps, in the household of His Majesty the Sultan of Jolo. Whether or not these datos are the only men who draw salaries from our Government I am not informed. I am apprehensive that when we learn the truth, we will discover that the eunuchs who protect the ladies of the Sultan's household from flies and other intruders will also be found upon the pay roll of this Government, and that the Treasury of the United States will soon be found encouraging unnecessary and undesirable surgery. This is what Professor Worcester says of this man:

The Moros of Basilan, locally called Yacans, have always borne a bad reputation, but at the time of our visit they were held in check by a remarkable man known as Dato (Chief) Pedro. His real name was Pedro Cuevas. At one time he had been confined as a convict at the penal settlement of San Ramon, in Mindanao, where he had been sent from one of the northern islands. With two companions he worked out a plan of escape. After behaving so well as to quiet suspicion, they suddenly attacked their guard when at work in the field, killed the Spanish officer in command, and escaped, taking a carbine with them.

That night they reached Ayala, where they murdered a Chinaman, plundered his shop, and stole a boat in which they crossed to Basilan. The story goes that they landed at a Moro village, where Pedro called for the dato, and boldly entered his house, narrowly escaping a lance which the enraged owner hurled at him as he came through the door. Pedro at once challenged him to come out and fight, which he was happy to do. Arming himself with a wooden shield and recovering his lance, he began the ridiculous prancing with which the people of his tribe preface the throwing of a weapon, whereupon Pedro banged away with his old carbine and killed his man, putting a bullet through his shield. He and his companions then devoted themselves to the remaining Moros with such effect that they decided they would rather fight with him than against him.

He next attacked another village, performing prodigies of valor, if accounts are to be believed, and having numerous narrow escapes. The Moros began to believe that he bore a charmed life, and as there is nothing which they admire so much as personal bravery, he soon gained a great influence over them, and they finally made him a dato.

He knew his people and ruled them with an iron hand, punishing the slightest opposition to his will with death. At first he did his own killing, but, when his reputation was once firmly established, he turned work of that sort over to his subordinates. If he chose to drive off a herd of cattle, and the owner ventured to object, Pedro only said "cut off his head," and it was done. If the father of a girl whom he wished to add to his large circle of wives protested, the answer was "cut off his head."

Pedro was shrewd enough to know that it was not worth while to fight the Spaniards, and when some of his unruly subjects made an unsuccessful attack on Zamboanga, he awaited their return, and gave them a vigorous drubbing. In return for this service he was forgiven for having killed a Spanish officer and committed a few other little indiscretions. At the time of our second visit to Basilan, in 1891, the governor was in constant communication with Dato Pedro, who still continued to keep his people in fairly good order, while if the Spanish officials happened to want the head of one of his subjects he had it cut off and forwarded at once.

During our stay he invited a former acquaintance in Mindanao to come over and go boar hunting with him. The Zamboangueno accepted the invitation. At the close of their day's sport they were standing in front of Pedro's house when a Moro from a neighboring village rode up on a fine horse. The visitor admired the horse and, when Pedro asked him if he would like it, thoughtlessly replied in the affirmative. Decidedly to his surprise, his host picked up a rifle, took deliberate aim, shot the Moro dead, and presented him with the mount. A hundred similar stories were told of this strange man, who, himself an alien, had succeeded in dominating an island full of pirates: had almost succeeded, I should rather say, for one large village, on a hill in the interior, still managed to hold out against him.

During the delivery of the foregoing, the time of Mr. SLAYDEN having expired, Mr. SULZER yielded to him three minutes more, and Mr. SLAYDEN resumed and completed his remarks.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to my colleague on the committee [Mr. Cox].

[Mr. COX addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield ten minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BERRY].

[Mr. BERRY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill as it stands. The only objection I would raise to it is that it does not go far enough. We have seen in the last few years that we need more officers than have been turned out from our Academy. I believe that this institution should be enlarged so that it will graduate enough cadets to fill vacancies in our Army. I would also like to see more of the graduates go into civil life and join our National Guard. The time has come when we must develop our National Guard, and bring it up to a higher state of efficiency, and I believe the proper way to do that is by enlarging our Military Academy, and making an inducement for its graduates to become identified with our militia organizations.

But taking into account only our active military establishment, it would require twice as many graduates as the present institution at West Point is capable of turning out to fill the vacancies occurring in our larger Army, and even then there would be left a considerable number of vacancies for the promotion of worthy noncommissioned officers. It is not enough that an officer having the command of men, and having their lives and health in his care, should be a man of general education, capable of learning the practical work of soldiering, but when put in such a position he should already be master of the technical and practical business of handling men according to the most improved methods and as required by the United States laws. It is just as necessary for an Army officer to have a professional education as it is for a doctor or a lawyer.

In 1898 our Government was called upon to meet an emergency which required the speedy raising of a large volunteer army. Our young men answered to the call for volunteers cheerfully and enthusiastically. They were brave, intelligent, and capable of being made into the finest soldiers in the world. The trouble and complaint about mismanagement at our camps was not due to the quality of the men, but was largely due to a lack of proper knowledge and technical training on the part of some of the officers. Of course there was some trouble due to the fact that our faulty system and the small appropriations in recent years made it impossible for the staff departments to furnish supplies as promptly as needed. It is hoped that before the end of the term of the present Congress has come that there may be a change in this system to avoid a recurrence of this defect in the future.

Now, with a perfect system it is absolutely necessary that our officers in the future shall understand the system and be thoroughly instructed in all the details which pertain to the drawing and handling of property, the making of reports and returns, and the other red tape necessary in every military establishment. They must understand the power, the use, and the care of their arms. They must understand the endurance of men and how to care for them in the field; the value of the different food articles, the amount of the different kinds of food required, and the importance of pure water; what baggage and camp equipment is required, and what is necessary; how to make use of the natural characteristics of the terrain in camping and in fighting offensively and defensively; how to make and interpret military maps, etc.

In short, without undertaking to enumerate all the different requirements, suffice it to say that an officer should be not only an educated gentleman but also master of his profession in order that he may be able to meet the new conditions and emergencies sure to arise in the case of any war, and that he may be able under all conditions to inspire confidence and enthusiasm in his men. [Applause.]

This country has never yet waged a war when there was a lack of brave men ready to fight. It can be said also with equal truth that both in the civil war and in the Spanish war there was great suffering and many deaths that might have been avoided. And undoubtedly in the beginning of both wars there was considerable

confusion due to lack of professional knowledge on the part of some of the officers. A lawyer or a doctor with some ability and a little military knowledge may meet with success in administering the affairs of a regiment in a post or in an armory; but if he is to handle them successfully in a campaign, he must also be a thorough soldier.

Now, we do not desire in this country to copy too much the systems of the Old World. I for one believe that it is incumbent upon us to work out a system of our own superior to any system now in use in Europe. We can improve on the Old World systems, and we ought to do it. The army of Germany works with the precision of a machine, and I have no doubt that the Germans think it is invincible. The same may be said of the systems of some of the other European powers.

Of course we should take into account the good features of these systems. They study well the country in which they are about to enter. Their plans are made in advance. Their armies move with exact precision at the time in the direction ordered, and the businesslike methods of the whole reflects great credit upon them. This was notably the case in the Franco-German war. But, Mr. Chairman, our conditions and methods are different. In the first place, we do not desire to sacrifice years out of the lives of our young men teaching them to be soldiers. What we desire is to let our young men be free to follow ordinary vocations and leave them to compete in the various pursuits of business and labor whereby the energy and intelligence of our people may be encouraged and developed, while at the same time building up the power and wealth of the nation. To meet any military necessity that may arise it is therefore necessary that we spread military knowledge and education as much as possible, with the least interference in the pursuits of our citizens and at the least expense to our great Government.

It is not necessary for us to hold a large body of idle men in readiness to do our fighting. In this country it has ever been our policy to have a small Regular Army and to keep its standard as high as possible, and to trust to the great mass of the people to fight the battles of this nation. I believe it is a wise policy. We will continue, as we have always done, to devote the energies of our people to the development of our resources. [Applause.]

But new conditions have arisen. It now remains for us to meet the new requirements in such a way as will bring the least burden upon the people and the least interference with this general policy and at the same time give us the best military establishment possible for the amount of means and energy expended on it. And in whatever changes we may make let us remember the importance of our regular establishment as a nucleus for any larger army that emergencies may make necessary, and let us develop and improve it with that end in view.

Referring to this subject, General McClellan, in an oration delivered June 15, 1864, said:

Our regular or permanent Army is the nucleus which, in time of peace, preserves the military traditions of the nation, as well as the organization, science, and instruction indispensable to modern armies. It may be regarded as coeval with the nation. It derives its origin from the old continental and State lines of the Revolution, whence, with some interruptions and many changes, it has attained its present condition. In fact, we may with propriety go even beyond the Revolution to seek the roots of our genealogical tree in the old French wars, for the *cis-Atlantic* campaigns of the seven years' war were not confined to the "red men scalping each other by the Great Lakes of North America," and it was in them that our ancestors first participated as Americans in the large operations of civilized armies.

American regiments then fought on the banks of the St. Lawrence and the Ohio, on the shores of Ontario and Lake George, on the islands of the Caribbean and in South America. Louisburg, Quebec, Duquesne, the Moro, and Porto Bello attest the value of the provincial troops, and in that school were educated such soldiers as Washington, Putnam, Lee, Montgomery, and Gates. These and men like Greene, Knox, Wayne, and Steuben were the fathers of our permanent Army, and under them our troops acquired that discipline and steadiness which enabled them to meet upon equal terms, and often to defeat, the tried veterans of England. The study of the history of the Revolution and a perusal of the dispatches at Washington will convince the most skeptical of the value of the permanent Army in achieving our independence and establishing the civil edifice which we are now fighting to preserve.

I am sure that if our Army is to be kept of a moderate size and to be used as a nucleus, all must admit the necessity of making it the best possible. Of what use would our officers be as instructors and organizers unless they are thoroughly educated in everything pertaining to their profession? General McClellan fully realized the importance of this fact, for he did more than any other one man to organize, discipline, and render effective the great army which, under the command of Grant, was destined afterwards to overcome the gallant Lee and his brave army in the most stubbornly fought war of modern times. [Applause.]

Not one word would I say to detract from the honor and the glory that belongs to the great men who have risen to high places in all our wars without the advantages of a professional education. Some men are born leaders. But it is the efficiency of the system which we desire to obtain by legislation looking to changes in our Army organization. Service in our Army in time of peace should guarantee a course of instruction to all men who enlist, and the best means of obtaining this is to begin with the young

men who are to hold commissions. Let their rank and preference come from their own efficiency, and it is our duty to seek to remove as far as possible from politics the government of our regular military establishment.

Excellent as our Military Academy is, nobody claims that it is perfect. In my humble judgment the course of instruction could be much improved by raising the standard of the entrance requirements to include a large part of what is now taught during the first year of the course there, and by adding to the course more practical and experimental work pertaining to the duties of an Army officer. Since the fixing of the course as it is now the public schools in this country have advanced, and the change is now practicable and desirable.

I believe that every graduate from the Academy, when he leaves the institution, should not only be thoroughly competent to command men in the drill field but should be as familiar with all books and papers, returns, requisitions, etc., used by officers in the line and in the different departments, as he is with the multiplication table. The practical duties of active service and campaigning on an extensive scale as it may be successfully carried on in different climates and under various circumstances should receive more attention. I am in favor of improving and at the same time enlarging the Academy.

There is another thing also to be remembered by the friends of the institution at this time. It should be kept as it is now, in touch with the people all over the United States. It is now an essentially democratic institution. Boys are appointed from the different Congressional districts, and they come and take their standing in the institution without regard to previous condition or previous social standing. The son of the millionaire must comply with the regulations exactly as the son of the humble toiler, and the position that each there assumes must depend upon his own individual merit.

I would oppose giving too many appointments to the President or to the concentration of appointments in any way whereby there would be encouraged a military class, or whereby the Academy could be used to take care of the sons of somebodies. Indeed I would rather see all appointments made by competitive examinations in the different districts throughout the country. My proposition is to double the size of the Academy and let each Congressional district have two cadets there.

The general effect in a large force of men of having among them a few thoroughly educated officers—I mean educated in military matters—can not be overestimated. The whole organization is bound to absorb, almost unconsciously, many ideas and much information from them. This is true of all the State militia forces where the State authorities have taken the trouble to have such officers associated with them, and is equally true when in time of war we distribute our well-trained officers and enlisted men among our large and hastily formed volunteer forces.

This question is of great importance now. Our new foreign policy and our expansion of territory and trade forbid our return to our small Regular Army of 25,000 at the expiration of the enlistment of the volunteers now in the Philippine Islands. Whether we think the Administration has acted for the best interests of this country in the settlement of the war with Spain or not, all must admit the conditions as they now exist. We should begin now to work out such a system as will best meet the new conditions.

To find some means whereby we can obtain competent men for the commissions in our United States forces and a certain number of professionally educated officers for our organized militia is a problem of the greatest importance and must be met at an early date. How better can we meet these requirements than by the enlargement of that institution, which was suggested by Washington, and has vindicated its existence by giving the country such worthy sons as Grant, Sherman, Sheridan, Meade, Thomas, McClellan, Howard, Merritt, J. H. Wilson, and Custer? [Applause.]

Our country will never be wanting in time of emergency for great commanders if we continue to send representative young men, taken from the body of the plain people and from all sections of the country, to be educated in an up-to-date Military Academy at this historic point on the Hudson. Here, under the influence of the traditions and associations which cling to this institution, and in the midst of scenes made memorable by the heroic deeds of the Continental army under the immortal Washington, our cadets may gain inspiration for deeds of valor while their minds and bodies are being trained for any duty their country may require. [Applause.]

As descriptive of the place, I quote the language of Professor Larned, referring to the "Battle Monument," which stands there on Trophy Point in honor of the officers and men of the Regular Army who died in battle during the civil war:

This granite shaft stands not as a memorial alone, but for a principle. It bears witness to the supremacy of discipline and education in the vocation of arms. It vindicates the professional soldier. It glorifies obedience, self-restraint, intelligence. It stands for duty, professional honor, responsibility,

order, precision. In the polished integrity of its unbroken mass the primeval granite, upright and unswerving, points heavenward the path of patriotism and of honor.

[Loud applause.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. RIDGELY].

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, while considering the bill before us for the support of our Military Academy and the extension and continuation of the education of our young men in the arts of war, which seem to be a necessity under the world's present condition of Christian (?) civilization, I will avail myself of the rule and privilege that have been adopted to consider and introduce as a part of my remarks some very recent statistics showing the industrial condition of our people, their resources, and ability for paying the expenses of the military arm of our Government.

These statistics of our productive industries and the market prices of our productions reveal a startling injustice in the division of values created by labor; the people as consumers are compelled, at present, to pay to the trusts and monopoly corporations from 50 to 150 per cent advance over the prices of three and four years ago on a long list of everyday necessities.

In presenting these statistics I will try to draw the attention of those who are watching the industrial conditions of our country and the ability of the taxpayer, on whom we draw so heavily, to the fact that as we rapidly progress along the lines of monopolizing the industries and commerce of this country by concentrated capital, owned by less than 10 per cent of the people of this nation, we are permitting the few in their supreme power to take unto themselves double prices and double return for their capital, while they divide with the laborer a mere pittance.

One of these remarkable facts is shown in the advance price of nails, which enters into the necessities of every civilized being in this nation. While they have advanced the price of nails from \$1.50 to \$3 a keg, the statistics show that the labor which enters into the production of a keg of nails has been advanced but 2 cents per keg, leaving \$1.48 to the trust.

And yet people stand here boasting of "prosperity" and "high wages" and telling us that of all the advanced prices on trust goods labor is getting its just portion. I shall put into the RECORD still more figures, showing that the consumer, the farmer, and the citizen generally are being compelled under these monopoly conditions to pay tribute to capital many times greater than the laboring classes are receiving in the increased wages of which we hear so much.

Mr. MAHON. Does the gentleman know how many kegs of nails a workman can make in one day; and can the gentleman multiply that by two?

Mr. RIDGELY. I can not answer the gentleman in regard to that particular.

Mr. MAHON. A workman can make about twenty kegs a day, and an advance of 2 cents a keg in wages means 40 cents advance for each day's labor.

Mr. RIDGELY. The gentleman claims that the advanced price of labor gives the man who makes nails an advance of 40 cents a day in wages. But it must be remembered that the people who consume those nails must pay an advance of \$1.50 a keg, making \$30 advance to the consumer on the twenty kegs, while the laborer gets only 40 cents out of the \$30. The gentleman's figures expose more clearly the fact that capital, under the protection and power of trusts, is robbing the people of this nation, and the gentleman's party is doing nothing adequate to break up these monopolies or to furnish the people all necessary instruments of production and distribution free of tribute to any man or class. This must be done.

Mr. MAHON. I want to say to the gentleman that 70 per cent or more of the value of nails and other forms of manufactured iron is labor; and if there is any advance in price, labor shares in that advance.

Mr. RIDGELY. Ah, but figures show too plainly the contrary.

Mr. MAHON. I have stated a simple fact.

Mr. RIDGELY. The sworn statements coming directly from the men who hire labor, detailing under oath the wages paid, the total labor cost of the products, and the prices received in the markets, confirm the figures I have presented.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. RIDGELY. Mr. Chairman, I will extend my remarks in the RECORD under the privilege, presenting some more fresh statistics on this line.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PAYNE having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PLATT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

S. 4167. An act to authorize a one-story addition to the post-office at Newark, N. J.;

S. 3303. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to provide condemned cannon and carriages for ornamentation purposes in the national cemetery at Knoxville, Tenn.;

S. 4448. An act to provide an American register for the ships *Star of Italy* and the *Star of Bengal*;

S. 4085. An act to correct the military record of C. R. Dickson;

S. 3197. An act to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia;

S. 4560. An act to provide for officers in the customs district of Hawaii; and

S. 4658. An act relating to the anchorage of vessels in the Kennebec River, at or near Bath, Me.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House was requested:

H. R. 10450. An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 2465. An act to grant an honorable discharge to George W. Shank; and

H. R. 996. An act providing for free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers, and reserving the public lands for that purpose.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1619) granting an increase of pension to Ella Cotton Conrad, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TURNER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1781) granting an increase of pension to Julia Mae N. Henry, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TURNER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1066) granting an increase of pension to Margaret B. Shipp.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1890) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Tradewell.

The message also announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2497) granting an increase of pension to Sarah W. Rowell, had asked a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GALLINGER, Mr. SHOUP, and Mr. TURNER as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

MILITARY ACADEMY BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. GLYNN].

[Mr. GLYNN addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JETT] such time as he may desire.

[Mr. JETT addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. SULZER. I trust the gentlemen on the other side will now use some of their time.

Mr. CAPRON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. DAVIDSON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Chairman, I make no objection to the pending bill. It is expected that a standing army of some size will always be needed by our Government. It is eminently proper, therefore, that the Military Academy should be so maintained and equipped that graduates therefrom may be thoroughly educated in the science of war. My purpose, however, in addressing the House at this time is to offer my humble testimonial to the efficiency of what is known as the National Guard of our country and to express my gratification at the passage of the bill to increase the appropriation for the proper equipment of the Guard from \$400,000 to \$1,000,000. As I have before stated, a standing or regular Army of some size is absolutely necessary.

I have never believed that it need be a very large one. In a republic, in a land where the people govern, there is no necessity for a large expenditure of government funds or for the taxation of the people for the purpose of maintaining a large standing army. That the Regular Army should be of sufficient size to properly man the coast defenses, the frontier posts, and such other military posts throughout the country as may be necessary is not doubted. Beyond this, however, there is no occasion for the expenditure of money in this way. The National Guard of the several States occupies an unique position. Primarily it is a State organization, yet it has been found to be a most effective aid to

the Regular Army in maintaining the nation's honor in time of war. This organization has been recognized by the General Government for many years, but it has never received the consideration that it has been entitled to.

In 1792 legislation was had affecting the militia of the country, and in that act every militiaman was required to be constantly provided with "a good musket or firelock of a bore sufficient for balls of the eighteenth part of a pound, a sufficient bayonet and belt, two spare flints, and a knapsack, a pouch with a box therein to contain not less than 24 cartridges suited to the bore of his musket or firelock, each cartridge to contain a proper quantity of powder and ball; or with a good rifle, knapsack, shot pouch, and powderhorn, 20 balls suited to the bore of his rifle, and a quarter of a pound of powder. Each commissioned officer shall be armed with a sword or hanger and spontoon."

That this law is still upon the statute books is the best evidence that legislation for the militia has not kept pace with the rapid development of the country along other lines. We have passed the age of flintlocks, and it is to the everlasting disgrace of our country that it had not passed the age of black powder before the Spanish war came on. Even poor old Spain, whose only claim for recognition among the nations of the earth was because of her connection with the antiquities of the past, was able to equip her army with Krag-Jørgensen and Mauser rifles using smokeless powder. To send our boys, either regulars or volunteers, into battle with old Springfields using black powder as against the modern firearms shows great negligence on the part of Congress in not properly equipping its military arm.

Some object to legislation in the interests of the militia because they are advocates of a large standing army. I believe, however, that a middle course can be pursued which will give better results than if we adopt either extreme.

In time of peace a regular army of reasonable size should be maintained, but in time of war we have always found it necessary to reinforce our Regular Army by a call for volunteers. Because of the loyalty and patriotism of our citizens, volunteers have always responded, and after receiving sufficient training they make the very best soldiers. No better army ever went into battle than that made up from the boys who came from the farms, from the shops, from the stores, and from the factories in the sixties, and who gave up profitable undertakings and lofty ambitions to serve their country in its hour of need. No matter how willing these citizens may be to enlist when their services are needed, it takes time to perfect an organization and to instruct them in those things necessary to be known by soldiers.

Now, is it not possible to so provide for the militia of the several States that they will always be ready when their services are tions properly officered, properly equipped, and properly trained needed? And when needed, they may go to the front as organization in all those things necessary to make their campaigns successful. Every State has its militia organization. In some States these organizations are better equipped, more thoroughly drilled, and better prepared for active service than in others; but if reasonable appropriations are made by the Government, a greater interest will be taken in the organizations of the several States, and, in my judgment, the time will soon come when the State laws will be but counterparts of the Regular Army Regulations so far as the enlistment, inspection, drill, and equipment of the organizations are concerned.

I believe the National Guard of a State when sworn into service should likewise take the oath of allegiance to the United States, so that when called upon they will be ready to serve the General Government as an organization, and thus avoid the necessity for the enlistment, inspection, and muster for service in the General Government of those who already are members of the State militia.

The National Guard of Wisconsin, owing to the high state of efficiency to which it has been brought by its present adjutant-general and his predecessors in office, stands to-day, in my judgment, second to none in the country. Before the Spanish war this National Guard was in splendid condition. It has its annual drill at a camp where lessons in practical campaign work are thoroughly taught, and it is to the honor of the Wisconsin National Guard that within four hours after orders were received from the General Government the quota to which Wisconsin was entitled was filled, and the several companies and regiments were on board trains en route to the place of rendezvous.

As a further illustration of their efficiency and splendid organization, I desire to refer to an incident which took place at Chickamauga, to which camp they were ordered. As the Wisconsin regiments left the trains and marched to the place assigned them in the camp, they passed in review before the general commanding, who asked, "What regiments are these?" When told that they were the National Guard of Wisconsin, he replied, "Those regiments are ready to go to the front to-day." Since the close of the Spanish war the National Guard of our State has been thoroughly reorganized and to-day is in better condition than ever be-

fore. At enlistment each man is thoroughly inspected, and, in my judgment, almost without exception the companies as now made up would pass the necessary examination to entitle each man to be mustered into the United States service. The militia has never been found wanting in patriotism or in readiness to serve its country.

Its members are the flower of the State. They are men of character, intelligence, and education—men who do not enlist for the purpose of being supported by the State or by the Government, but for the purpose of being educated in the science of warfare, that they may better serve their country in her hour of need. They devote many hours and days to this service without compensation. How important it is, therefore, that when the country does need their services, it should be in a position to secure it, and in return it should not hesitate to appropriate sufficient money so that the Guard may be thoroughly equipped and ready for whatever service they may be called upon to perform.

As a State organization the militia owes allegiance to the State and should serve it in local matters. There is no reason, however, why the Government should not work with the State in equipping and otherwise perfecting their organizations, and in return receive the benefit of the thorough military training which these men receive.

In this way the Government can have at its command, and at but little expense, a thoroughly organized, trained, and equipped national reserve force, ready for immediate use in time of need. This is the object of the proposed legislation.

I sincerely hope, therefore, that the bill appropriating \$1,000,000 will become a law and that the National Guard may receive the benefit therefrom. I hope in due time other and further legislation may be had to the end that the National Guard may be given the standing in the country which it deserves, and become in fact the great national reserve of citizen soldiers, following their several vocations in times of peace, but ready to defend their nation's honor and their nation's flag in time of war. This is the kind of military strength which a republic should have, and having it, needs but little else.

Mr. CAPRON. I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JONES] such time as he may desire.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to take the time of this House in discussing the merits of this bill. There is no opposition to it, and it would probably be out of order to speak in order. Nor will I take the time of this House in speaking upon political topics, because no one would listen, and I care not to speak to empty and unresponsive seats. Neither is it necessary for me to speak upon such topics for home consumption. Our people are too thoughtful and intelligent to be imposed upon in such a way; and, furthermore, they not only know where I stand upon the great questions of vital interest to them, but they also know where they stand upon these questions. Intelligent, courageous, and progressive themselves, they believe in the development, progress, and onward march of the Republic. As their sons bravely carried the flag of their country across the ocean and planted it at the gateway of the Orient, they propose to see it stay there. Nor do they have any fears that it will mean aught there except justice, law, order, freedom, and civilization, according to the capacities and conditions of the people over which it floats.

The lack of knowledge, however, displayed regarding our State and its resources among the people of the East has led me to conclude to make a few statements relative thereto. While we have a climate milder in winter and cooler in summer than Washington City, men have asked me if it is possible to enjoy oneself in such a high latitude. While we produce almost all sorts of agricultural products, men have wondered how we could afford to live there and buy things from the East. While we have the best and largest Government dock on the Pacific, high officials of the Government have refused to allow transports to come to Puget Sound "because they could not be docked." While Puget Sound is connected with the Pacific Ocean by a channel from 3 to 12 miles wide and from 300 to 600 feet deep, a great statesman of our country asked if there was any channel by which large vessels could reach the sea. These and other similar instances of ignorance relative to our State have led me to use this opportunity to give some little information that may be of some benefit to us in the future and serve to give the representatives of the people a more correct idea of what is destined to be the gem of the Union. If a few will listen and a few will read, I shall be satisfied.

I am proud to represent in part the great State of Washington, with its more than 69,000 square miles of domain and its 600,000 people. It is indeed an imperial State with a grand people. It is almost as large as all New England and Delaware and Maryland. From every State in the Union have come the choice sons and daughters to build a State in the great Northwest worthy of the Father of his Country. Our people are honest, vigorous, energetic, refined, cultured, and patriotic. They exemplify the same indomitable will and courage that impelled the early pioneers of this country. It takes courage and manhood to cut loose from

home and friends and friendly associations and brave a new country and compete with a new people. Such our people have done. The result is that they are hospitable, sympathetic, and self-reliant. They have brought with them the culture and refinement of the East and elevated them.

Our schools and churches are of the best. Our percentage of uneducated is very low. Our percentage of higher education is very large. In every avocation may be found graduates from the best Eastern colleges. You find them in our academies and colleges; at the heads of stores and manufacturing establishments; on the farm and in the workshop; swinging the pick and shovel and dwelling in the forests, subduing nature in her wilds. With such a people developing her great and varied resources Washington's destiny is assured.

CLIMATIC CONDITIONS.

There is much ignorance relative to the climate of Washington. It is one of the States along our northern border, lying between the forty-sixth and forty-ninth degrees of north latitude, and the general impression is that it is very cold. Nothing could be further from the truth. In no State in the Union are the climatic conditions more varied, equable, and pleasant. The most fastidious can satisfy all his desires in this direction.

The State is divided into two parts by the great Cascade Range, running north and south. Just west of the western boundary are the great Rocky Mountains. Thus more than half of the State lies as an immense basin between these two ranges. As you go from the southern part of this basin to the north the country rises gradually until, in the north, it becomes quite mountainous and the temperature is colder. Over this basin the rainfall is comparatively slight, increasing, however, to the eastward and decreasing to the westward and south. North Yakima is in the eastern part, and the part of least precipitation; Walla Walla is in the southeastern part, and Spokane is in the northeast, and these three points represent well the varieties in temperature and precipitation all over this great basin.

In the table submitted below is shown the extremes at each of these points during the last year. The last year was also an extreme year, especially so far as cold was concerned. During the last ten years several winters have not seen the thermometer below zero at North Yakima. The degrees of the thermometer, however, do not give an accurate idea of the climate. The air over this vast region is dry, the moisture being taken out in the mountains. You have none of that heated, steamy atmosphere in which you sweat and swelter here in the East. While the sun is hot, in the shade you are cool and comfortable. With the twilight comes the cool, soft, balmy breezes from snow-covered moun-

tains, bringing comfort, rest, and peace, and sweet, refreshing sleep.

There is not a night in the year that you can not sleep in perfect comfort. You begin each day rested and refreshed. The winters also are ideal. They come on gradually, one day a little cooler than its predecessor. Then we have snow from 6 inches to a foot deep, more, of course, as you go to the mountains. The thermometer may go below zero, but if it does, you only enjoy it the more. It makes the blood bound through the system, brings a glow to the cheek, a sparkle to the eye, and renewed strength to the step, indicative of new life and vitality. The air is dry, still, and quiet. There are none of those damp, wintry winds of the East that strike to the very marrow and chill and benumb us as we pursue our way of business or pleasure. If we get wind in winter, it is the soft, warm Chinook, coming up the mighty Columbia from the sea, making the daisies smile in the lap of winter.

When summer passes, you regret it; when winter comes, you rejoice. There is but little rain in the summer; more toward the eastward and north. No cyclones or dangerous thunderstorms save in the mountains. Probably three days out of four are clear the whole year through. In the summer cool, quiet, restful mountain resorts can be reached in a day's travel. West of the Cascade Mountains there is the slope to the sea save to the north, where Puget Sound lies between the Cascade Range and the eternal snow-peaked Olympics, whose western slope is bathed in the waters of the Pacific. From the middle of May until October the climate of this region is simply delightful. With skies clear and cloudless and the thermometer hardly ever above 90°, the air comes laden with the salt breezes of the Sound and the Pacific, and, permeated with the ozone of the mountains, it is the well man's delight and the sick man's invigorator. From the middle of October until the middle of May we have what is termed the "rainy" season. It does not rain all the time, however, although much of the time it is cloudy, with frequent showers.

As will be seen by the table below, the rainfall is not much greater than at Washington City, but it mostly falls in the period mentioned. The temperature seldom goes below 10° above zero, and snows stay on the ground but a short time. This is said to be the most healthy season of the year.

Along the seashore and among the many islands of Puget Sound are ideal summer resorts, with sea bathing, boat sailing, and trout fishing to while away the hours. In winter, if you want to escape the rain, four hours' ride brings you to perpetual sunshine and a fine, dry, bracing atmosphere. In summer, if you would escape the warm suns of the eastern slope, and do not want to go to the mountains, a four hours' ride brings you to cool, soft, balmy, salt air.

TEMPERATURES AND PRECIPITATION.

The following table, compiled from records of the United States Weather Bureau, shows the highest and lowest temperatures and precipitation at nine weather bureaus in the State, by months, for the past year, ending December 1.

Month.	Tacoma.			Aberdeen.			Port Townsend.			Vancouver.			Spokane.			Walla Walla.			North Yakima.			Kennewick.			Colfax.		
	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.*	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.	Highest temp.	Lowest temp.	Precipitation.
December, 1899.....	60	32	4.7	55	24	10.9	57	28	1.8	54	13	4.5	50	-2	0.9	63	-4	0.8	67	-4	0.5	71	-8	0.2	50	-6	0.9
January, 1899.....	55	14	9.2	54	22	18.0	53	18	2.8	60	15	6.5	54	-21	3.8	60	-4	2.3	54	-15	7.4	65	-13	1.6	55	-18	3.3
February, 1899.....	55	9	4.5	53	13	12.4	57	10	2.6	60	6	4.4	50	-12	1.4	59	-6	2.8	61	-10	0.4	63	-6	1.2	55	-14	3.3
March, 1899.....	57	23	3.8	59	27	4.6	54	31	1.6	63	26	2.5	54	18	1.2	60	28	2.2	68	16	T.	67	29	0.2	69	22	1.9
April, 1899.....	71	32	4.6	72	28	9.5	67	34	1.4	74	31	3.8	72	28	1.5	76	32	1.7	75	19	0.1	79	23	0.4	75	23	2.4
May, 1899.....	68	38	2.8	69	34	4.4	66	38	1.7	68	35	4.0	79	32	1.0	80	37	1.5	81	24	0.5	86	35	0.3	78	28	1.4
June, 1899.....	76	40	1.3	77	36	2.7	68	40	1.0	81	36	1.2	86	42	0.6	90	42	0.7	91	37	T.	97	42	0.1	84	36	1.0
July, 1899.....	89	47	0.2	90	44	0.3	87	46	1.1	93	44	0.1	88	45	0.3	102	47	T.	102	40	0.1	106	47	0.1	83	36	T.
August, 1899.....	77	45	2.3	77	43	3.2	76	44	2.5	85	42	3.0	89	43	1.3	93	47	2.2	94	38	1.1	96	45	1.4	86	33	2.4
September, 1899.....	81	44	1.9	84	43	2.3	76	44	0.8	83	42	1.8	89	40	1.1	94	46	1.2	97	34	0.5	94	38	0.4	91	28	1.5
October, 1899.....	80	32	3.2	81	30	9.2	76	35	1.8	78	26	5.0	79	21	2.2	83	30	3.1	80	16	0.8	83	22	1.7	(+)	(+)	2.5
November, 1899.....	64	38	10.1	65	39	22.8	63	41	3.2	68	35	9.1	65	28	3.8	72	31	2.8	63	25	2.2	68	27	1.4	(+)	(+)	4.5
Extremes.....	89	9	—	90	13	—	87	10	—	93	6	—	98	-21	—	102	-6	—	102	-15	—	106	-13	—	93	-18	—
Totals.....	—	—	48.6	—	—	100.3	—	—	22.3	—	—	45.9	—	—	19.1	—	—	21.3	—	—	13.6	—	—	9.0	—	—	25.1

* Inches.

† Missing.

For purposes of comparison, it is interesting to note that the average highest temperature for a term of years, at Tacoma, is 91°; Boston, 95°; Washington, 97°; St. Louis, 99°; St. Paul, 97°. Lowest temperature: Tacoma, 17°; Boston, 4°; Washington, 5°; St. Louis, 3°; St. Paul, -24°. Average yearly precipitation: Tacoma, 44.6 inches; Boston, 45.4; Washington, 42.9; St. Louis, 40.8; St. Paul, 23.2.

North Yakima is about the center of the State, both north and south and east and west. From this point Colfax is about 125 miles east, Walla Walla 120 miles southeast, Kennewick 85 miles southeast, Spokane 150 miles northeast, Vancouver 150 miles southwest, Aberdeen 200 miles west, Tacoma 125 miles northwest, and Port Townsend about 175 miles northwest. This table, therefore, gives a most excellent idea of the prevailing conditions of the whole State so far as temperature and precipitation are concerned.

AGRICULTURE.

There are about 7,000,000 acres of good agricultural land in the State, and while there are many fertile and productive valleys and islands west of the Cascade Mountains, most of the agricultural lands and products are east of the mountains. Lying just east of these mountains, along the Yakima River, is the far-famed Yakima Valley, made up of many smaller valleys lying between the eastern foothills of the Cascades. In this valley the annual precipitation

is from 5 to 15 inches, and consequently crops can not be produced without irrigation, except upon the table-lands where there is sufficient rainfall to mature wheat.

"Irrigation is king." Without water the land is a desert; with water it blossoms as the rose. The soil is amazingly fertile. Many ditches have been constructed, and thousands of acres have been put under cultivation. At least four crops of alfalfa are harvested annually, and from 7 to 10 tons to the acre. Two thousand pounds of hops to the acre is about the average crop, and it will be of interest to the hop man to know that spraying is never required in this valley, although it is west of the mountains, where many hops are also produced. Apples, peaches, plums, prunes, apricots, and pears are produced most profusely and of the largest size and finest quality and flavor. Forty thousand pounds of apples and prunes per acre from seven-year old trees, and 20,000 pounds of peaches from four-year old trees. Pears and apricots in like proportion. Blackberries, raspberries, strawberries, and grapes are produced in the greatest abundance. Watermelons grow in size that would make a darkey's eyes pop out in amazement and of a flavor that would fill him with delight.

Lying along each side of the Columbia River is a large territory of the same sort of soil, but unirrigated. This land is now practically a desert, covered only with sagebrush. To the north is a broad, high table-land, known as the "Big Bend," producing about 5,000,000 bushels of wheat, and capable of producing much more. In the eastern and southeastern parts of the State we find the greatest wheat fields in the world. This is the Palouse and Walla Walla country. It is quite hilly, but the hills are as productive as the valleys. The yield is enormous, 25 bushels to the acre being a poor crop and 60 and 70 not uncommon. The annual production is about 15,000,000 bushels. The finest of fruit is also produced in this region and more land is being set to orchard from year to year.

GRAZING.

There are about 14,000,000 acres of grazing lands. Thousands of head of cattle and horses are allowed to roam the hills, while hundreds of thousands of sheep are herded in the mountains every year.

LUMBERING.

The lumber possibilities are wonderful. There are about 30,000,000 acres of timber. East of the Cascades it is scattering and comparatively small, the trees ranging from a foot to 3 feet in diameter and from 75 to 125 feet in height. This would be splendid timber in the East. West of the Cascades is the great timber region. From the summit to the sea is one dense forest except where it has been cleared by the hardy pioneer.

The following statement is taken from the Nineteenth Annual Report of the Director of the Geological Survey:

With the exception of the redwoods of California, the forests of Washington are the densest, heaviest, and most continuous in the United States. Except for a few prairie openings, and except where removed by fire or the ax, they cover the country as a thick mantle from high up on the Cascade range westward to the shores of the Pacific. In all this region only the Olympics rear a few summits above the forests. Not only are the forests dense overhead, but the undergrowth is dense and tangled beneath.

Here, indeed, is the "forest primeval." Here are forest solitudes as yet undisturbed by man's presence.

Great trees, straight as an arrow, lift their pointed tops from 200 to 325 feet in the air, from 100 to 150 feet without a knot or a limb, and from 3 to 20 feet in diameter. One tree in Whatcom County contained over 400,000 feet of lumber, or more than enough to construct 8 7-room cottages. This timber is mostly fir, cedar, hemlock, and spruce, in the order given. According to the estimate given by Professor Gannett, which I will insert in my remarks, there are over 114,000,000,000 feet of lumber in the forests of Washington. The lumber industry, although in its infancy, is developing very rapidly.

The following, taken from the Nineteenth Annual Report of the Director of the Geological Survey, shows the growth of the lumber industry of California, Oregon, and Washington up to 1890:

State.	Year.	Number of mills.	Capital.	Cost of material.	Value of products.
California	1870	291	\$3,856,000	\$1,986,000	\$5,227,000
	1880	251	6,455,000	2,243,000	4,229,000
	1890	221	15,834,000	4,356,000	8,454,000
Oregon	1870	165	913,000	358,000	1,014,000
	1880	228	1,578,000	1,331,000	2,030,000
	1890	300	7,543,000	2,979,000	5,995,000
Washington	1870	46	1,285,000	580,000	1,307,000
	1880	37	2,456,000	1,188,000	1,735,000
	1890	310	19,445,000	7,930,000	15,068,000

On January 1, 1899, there were 511 saw and shingle mills in the State, with 10,339 men employed. During the year 5,694,000 feet of lumber were sawed and 23,184,000 shingles made daily. January 1, 1900, found 637 mills in operation, with a capacity of

7,000,000 feet of sawed lumber and 28,000,000 shingles per day, and employing 16,000 men. Our total shipments last year were 625,000,000 feet of lumber, 54,950,000 laths, and over 4,000,000,000 shingles. This does not include the local trade.

Professor Gannett, of the Geological Survey, estimates the total amount of standing timber in the State of Washington at about 114,778,000,000 feet B. M., of which 104,500,000,000 are west of the crest of the Cascades, and the remainder, about 10,000,000,000, is east of the Cascades.

The following is his estimate of the merchantable timber in the State of Washington, by counties:

County.	Feet of timber, B. M.	County.	Feet of timber, B. M.
Asotin	81,000,000	Lincoln	14,000,000
Chehalis	18,597,000,000	Mason	2,091,000,000
Challam	9,072,000,000	Okanogan	2,665,000,000
Clarke	2,342,000,000	Pacific	7,813,000,000
Columbia	243,000,000	Pierce	6,520,000,000
Cowlitz	5,216,000,000	Skagit	10,382,000,000
Douglas	31,000,000	Skamania	4,661,000,000
Ferry	1,067,000,000	Snohomish	7,709,000,000
Garfield	170,000,000	Spokane	786,000,000
Island	430,000,000	Stevens	2,702,000,000
Jefferson	4,230,000,000	Thurston	2,787,000,000
King	7,644,000,000	Wahkiakum	2,974,000,000
Kitsap	1,141,000,000	Walla Walla	5,000,000
Kittitas	1,200,000,000	Whatcom	1,346,000,000
Klickitat	743,000,000	Whitman	35,000,000
Lewis	8,586,000,000	Yakima	893,000,000

He also makes the following summary of timber in western Washington:

Species.	Feet, B. M.	Per cent of total.
Fir	66,208,861,000	64
Cedar	16,192,276,000	16
Hemlock	14,699,759,000	14
Spruce	6,402,605,000	6

MINING.

The mineral development in the State is in its infancy. Enough prospecting and work has been done, however, to show that there are vast quantities of minerals of various kinds throughout the State. Inaccessibility and ruggedness of territory have greatly retarded prospecting. The eastern part of the State has been more prospected and developed than any other on account of its greater accessibility. Gold, silver, coal, copper, and iron ores have been found in different localities in paying quantities. Coal is being mined quite extensively, and prospects show that the coal fields of Washington are among the largest in the country. The coal is mostly bituminous, and is of excellent steaming and coking qualities. Most of the coal mining at present is done in Kittitas, Pierce, and King counties. The total output in 1899 was about 2,000,000 tons. Most of the coal used in San Francisco is supplied by the mines of Washington. Several rich, gold-bearing quartz mines and placers have been discovered. Beds of rich silver ore have been found at various points, and copper and lead mines of great richness are being worked. The gold output for 1894 was \$195,100; 1897, \$419,900; 1898, \$766,200; and 1899, \$1,000,000.

FISH AND FISHERIES.

One of the great industries of Washington is the fish industry. This has developed most rapidly in the last few years and bids fair to reach enormous proportions. The rivers of the western coast, together with the various bays and arms of the ocean and Puget Sound, are alive with fish of all sorts, of which the "lordly salmon" is of the most importance commercially. These fish are found in countless numbers and of great size, varying from 7 pounds to 75 pounds weight. They are caught by the thousands. The Sockeye salmon, which has its spawning grounds up the Frazier River, British Columbia, must pass through an arm of Puget Sound in order to reach this river. These salmon do not seem to ascend any other river than the Frazier, and there is only one way by which they can reach it and that is through American waters. It is therefore not difficult for the fishermen to set their traps along the course these fish must pass in order to reach their spawning grounds. Traps are used to a great extent, and the catch is sometimes enormous, as high as 30,000 salmon, weighing from 8 to 12 pounds each, have been taken from a single trap in one day.

The total salmon pack for Washington in 1899 was about 1,000,000 cases, or about 48,000,000 pounds. The pack in 1898 was only about 500,000 cases. The oyster fisheries also are becoming quite important. The Olympia oysters are small, but of a fine flavor, and are increasing very rapidly. Experiments have been made in planting the Eastern oyster in Puget Sound and some of the Pacific bays, with very good prospect of success. Halibut, sturgeon, shrimp, crabs, clams, and many other salt-water delicacies are found in

abundance. There are in the State twelve State fish hatcheries and two United States Government hatcheries, with a total annual capacity of about 100,000,000 young salmon. The State is taking a great interest in this industry, and it bids fair to become one of the most important in the State.

COMMERCIAL ADVANTAGES.

No other State in the Union has greater commercial advantages than the State of Washington. The Columbia River flows through the northern and central parts of the State and along the southern boundary for about 150 miles. When the obstruction at The Dalles is overcome, as it will be in the near future, the river will be navigable through a great part of the State for a distance of nearly 600 miles, furnishing a great inland highway for the transportation of products of what is called the "inland empire." Along the coast there are numerous gulfs and bays with splendid harbor facilities, in which flow rivers that are navigable for a considerable distance into the interior, thereby furnishing ship connection for the lumber industry with ocean transportation. Superior to all is Puget Sound.

There is probably no other body of water in the world similar to Puget Sound. It is an island sea or a great harbor in itself, divided into numerous channels, inlets, and ports, and dotted with countless islands. It connects with the Pacific Ocean through the Strait of Juan de Fuca. The entire length of its coast line, including that around its many islands, is about 2,000 miles, the entire distance of which is within the confines of the State of Washington. The Strait of Juan de Fuca is about 11 miles wide at the mouth. Its channel and the various channels into which Puget Sound is divided are very deep. Along the shores, however, are numerous inlets and ports, furnishing the best harbor facilities in the world.

Its character and location make Puget Sound one of the most important commercial centers in the United States, and, in the judgment of many, it is destined to be one of the greatest commercial centers of the world. Its foreign commerce now requires annually at least 3,000,000 tons and its domestic trade is of equal or greater importance. Numerous cities are building along its shores, among the most important of which are Blaine, Port Townsend, Olympia, Whatcom, Everett, Tacoma, and Seattle, with an aggregate population of probably 250,000 people. This population is rapidly growing and at no distant day it is not too much to expect to find a million people living along its shores.

It is to-day the gateway to Alaska. In its cities thousands of people are outfitting and through its channels they are passing to the frozen though golden shores of Alaska, leaving behind them sources of wealth and prosperity probably superior to that to which they go. It is also the key to unlock the doors of the Oriental world. China and the Philippines are nearer to Puget Sound by 2,000 miles on a round-trip voyage than is San Francisco. From San Francisco to Hongkong it is 7,530 miles; from Puget Sound, 6,598. The great differences in favor of Puget Sound and the saving in transportation can not help but redound to its advantage, and must eventually bring the great mass of the Oriental trade through its portals. Already three transcontinental railway lines terminate upon its shores, and as the Orient develops, so must Puget Sound develop, and its growth is destined to exceed the wildest dreams of the most visionary. Tributary to it are all the great resources of the Northwest. Billions of feet of lumber and millions of tons of coal, with inexhaustible agricultural supplies, are within easy distance of its ports and must find outlet through them.

Puget Sound seems to be the very culmination of nature's handiwork on the American continent. By the guiding hand of nature were dredged her deep channels and her vast harbors hollowed out, so that man has nothing to do in this respect. No dredging is required to make her channels deeper or her ports more suitable for the largest vessels now afloat or that the future has in store. With these great commercial advantages and with her great commercial improvements of the present and the prospects for the future, it is most important that proper means of defense shall be established for their protection in time of war.

The Strait of Juan de Fuca is about 11 miles wide at the mouth. Extending into it from the north is the island of Vancouver, on the southern side of which is the English fortified dockyard Esquimalt, which, to a certain extent, commands the entrance to Puget Sound. This dry dock is being strongly fortified by the English, and is destined at no distant day to be the Gibraltar of America. It is agreed by all expert engineers that Puget Sound can not be made impregnable by means of land batteries or submarine mines and torpedoes. The real entrance to Puget Sound proper is through Admiralty Inlet and Deception Pass.

Deception Pass can be made impregnable by means of land batteries in connection with its own inherent impregnability, and while Admiralty Inlet can be exceptionally defended by a set of land batteries, yet its channel is so wide and deep that submarine torpedoes and mines can not be used, and therefore it is not impossible for vessels of modern build, taking advantage of the tide

and other local conditions, to run these batteries and get within the confines of Puget Sound. Once there, without adequate means of resistance, the commercial interests of Puget Sound would be at their mercy. The only means of proper defense is to have an equal naval force, and in order to have this a fleet of naval vessels must be kept at or near Puget Sound. For this purpose a complete naval station is necessary as a base of supplies and repairs.

The western seas and oceans are becoming of the greatest importance to the United States. There is likely to be the arena for the operations of our Navy of the future. Our western coast line is most extended. From the southern part of California to the Straits of Fuca is a distance of 1,250 miles, and with the windings of the coast of Puget Sound there is a coast line of over 3,000 miles. Then there is the immense coast line of Alaska and the islands included therein, in extent probably 25,000 miles. The necessity for large navy-yards along this immense coast line is very important in view of the future. We have but two naval stations—one at Mare Island, Cal., and the other at Bremerton or Port Orchard, on Puget Sound, in the State of Washington. That we should have at least two full and complete navy-yards on the Pacific coast is very evident. With this Admiral Endicott agrees. The navy-yard at Mare Island is now quite extensive.

Immense sums have been expended, and yet our Government officers are uncertain as to whether or not it is advisable to continue the appropriations for a navy-yard at that point, for reasons I will briefly mention later on. The Bureau, however, continues to recommend large appropriations, and Congress continues to make them, with all the uncertainties that exist relative thereto. All must agree that we should have one complete navy-yard in the southern part, or near the southern part, of our western coast, and also a complete navy-yard at or near the northern part of the main coast line of the United States. The naval station at Port Orchard, or Bremerton, Wash., has advantages that I believe no other yard in the United States possesses. This site appears to be an ideal one from almost every standpoint.

It seems that nature had in view the necessities of a great nation when she formed this site, and yet our people do not seem to realize this, nor do the officers of the Navy seem to realize its advantages. A navy-yard on the northern coast was provided for by act of Congress approved September 7, 1888, which act provided for a commission to select a site for a navy-yard and dry dock north of the forty-second parallel of north latitude in the State of Oregon and the then Territory of Washington and Alaska, and directed that this commission should select a suitable site, having a due regard to the commercial and naval necessities of the coast, for a navy-yard and dry dock. This commission was appointed by the Hon. W. C. Whitney, Secretary of the Navy, and consisted of Capt. A. Mahan, United States Navy, Commander C. M. Chester, and Lieut. C. A. Stockton. In his letter to the president of the commission Secretary of the Navy Whitney directed the attention of the commission to the following special requirements for a special station:

- First. A situation upon a good harbor of sufficient depth and accessibility for vessels of the largest size and heaviest draft.
- Second. A favorable position with regard to the principal lines of defense.
- Third. A local security from water attack, due to position and natural surroundings.
- Fourth. Ample water frontage of sufficient depth and permanence and with currents of moderate rapidity.
- Fifth. A favorable position with respect to the lines of interior communication (by rail or otherwise) with the principal sources of supplies.
- Sixth. That the character of the ground shall be suitable for the construction of excavated docks and basins and for heavy structures.
- Seventh. Proximity to centers of labor and supplies of material.
- Eighth. Healthfulness of the climate and its suitability for out-of-door labor.
- Ninth. The existence in the vicinity of an ample supply of good, potable water.

These are the principal requirements of an ideal location for a navy-yard. There is probably no navy-yard in the United States that combines all of these requirements, and the one that comes the nearest to combining these requirements should certainly command the attention of Congress. A navy-yard is an expensive institution at the best, and that locality where a navy-yard can be constructed and maintained at the least expense is the most desirable place, especially if it is well located with a view to the purposes and objects for which it is to be used.

This commission, after a most careful and thorough investigation, reported unanimously in favor of Port Orchard as a location for the navy-yard on the north coast of the United States.

On June 30, 1890, Congress passed another act requiring the President to appoint another commission composed of two competent naval officers, one competent Army officer, and two competent persons from civil life, whose duty it should be to select a suitable site, having due regard to the commercial and naval necessities, for a dry dock at some point on the Pacific Ocean or the water connected therewith north of the parallel of latitude marking the northern boundary of California, including the waters of Puget Sound, and also lakes Union and Washington, in the State of

Washington. Under and pursuant to this act the President appointed as members of this commission Capt. T. O. Selfridge, United States Navy; Col. George H. Mendell, Corps of Engineers, United States Army; Hon. F. C. Platt and Hon. R. W. Thompson, and Lieut. A. B. Wyckoff, United States Navy. This commission also made a very careful and thorough examination of the coast of the United States within the boundaries of Oregon and the State of Washington and unanimously recommended Port Orchard as the most suitable site for the location of a naval station.

Thus we see that two Congresses recognized the importance of a naval station on the Northern Pacific coast, and two commissions of competent, experienced, and disinterested men united in selecting Port Orchard as the most suitable location for such a station. It would seem that this unanimous judgment of nine competent, experienced men should have considerable weight as to the adaptability of this location for the desired purpose.

After these reports had been made Congress acted upon their decision and made an appropriation of over a million dollars for the construction of a dry dock at that point. This dry dock was built in 1896 at a cost of \$633,636.33, and additional appropriations have been made for the construction of officers' buildings, machine shops, etc. It is the only port on the Pacific coast at which battle ships can be docked.

It is not because the dock at Mare Island is not of sufficient size, but simply because it is impossible for large battle ships to reach the dock, while at Port Orchard at any and all times the largest battle ships now constructed or that ever will be constructed can reach the dock without any trouble. At this dock the battle ship *Oregon* had her bilge keels put on before she made her memorable trip around the Horn, and had it not been for the Port Orchard dock she would not have been able to have been prepared for the long voyage, and the results of the battle at Santiago might have been different from what it was. Last year the battle ship *Iowa* had to go to Port Orchard to be docked. These two immense vessels were safely docked without any damage to the structure, and while docks upon the Atlantic coast were being injured and while the officers of the Navy Department were fearful for the safety not only for the docks themselves, but for the vessels, the *Oregon* and *Iowa* were resting safely on the floor of Port Orchard dock, and when they were taken off had not shrunk a thousandth part of an inch.

The officers of the Navy Department do not seem to look with much favor upon the Port Orchard dry dock and naval station. In their reports they have but little to say in its favor, and I here desire to notice some of the criticisms and statements made regarding it.

Admiral Endicott, in his report for 1898, page 32, makes the following statement:

This station contains a dry dock of the largest capacity, a machine shop for construction and repair, general storehouse, and a machine shop for the Bureau of Steam Engineering is provided for, so that the yard is fitted for ordinary repairs to the vessels of the Navy. The few objects above enumerated are considered important for improving the station in some respects, which will add to its efficiency and facilitate the work of the several bureaus. No extensive improvements are contemplated at present, unless it should be the desire of Congress to very much increase the establishment at this point and do a considerable portion of the work for the Navy upon this part of the coast.

Moderate facilities are valuable at this station, but if it be important that this country equip a first-class naval station or yard in this vicinity, near the limit of its boundary, which the Bureau believes, then another site should be sought which combines the essential requirements of such a yard in a near-by population supplying enough skilled labor, a market with supplies conveniently and quickly available, and direct railroad connection with a trunk line for the quick and economical transport of material.

The present site possesses none of these desiderata. The nearest city of considerable size is 15 miles away. Communication with the rest of the world is by water carriage over this distance, and the little work done at the station has been done under disadvantages. When a naval vessel has been docked and repaired, skilled men have been supplied and transported at great expense from the Mare Island yard. Under these circumstances it is doubtful if it be wise to build up a very large establishment at this station and provide for more than docking and slight repairs, unless no suitable site near one of the large cities and railroad connections can be had.

He states that no extensive improvements are contemplated "unless it should be the desire of Congress to very much increase the establishment at this point and do a considerable portion of the work for the Navy upon this part of the coast." It would seem that Congress has pretty well indicated its idea and intention in this matter by having appropriated almost a million and a half of money, of which amount a million has already been spent upon this yard. Just how much of an expenditure and just in what way the Bureau would desire to give expression to its desires is unnecessary. That we should have a first class naval station or yard on Puget Sound is admitted by everyone, and Mr. Endicott himself states that he believes that this should be done. But he suggests that another site be sought for such a yard or station.

Without intending in any way to reflect upon Admiral Endicott, it would seem that the fact that two commissions of able and experienced naval officers, after a very careful personal examination of the various sites, have unanimously agreed upon Port

Orchard as the most proper and suitable site for a naval station should be almost conclusive upon this point. And when Admiral Endicott suggests that it is not the best point, we have the opinions of nine other men, equally competent, to offset his opinion.

But what are his objections to this site?

They are these: He objects to it because there is no near-by population supplying enough skilled labor. This objection was very carefully considered by the commission that selected this point, and in their report regarding this they make this statement:

The distance from centers of labor seems of more consequence. The intermittent activity which characterizes our navy-yards, the taking on and discharge of men according to the state of the appropriation, the necessity for increasing the force largely on emergency make it an undoubted inconvenience to have a navy-yard distant from the ordinary abodes of the required labor. The inducements afforded by navy-yards under present conditions, and especially under the eight-hour law, may probably be relied upon to meet this difficulty, which reduces itself mainly to the question of providing lodging and food on the spot for a considerable temporary increase in the working force. This difficulty is minimized by the abundance and cheapness of lumber and the conditions of the climate, which is so moderate as to admit of men living comfortably and healthfully in the merest shells.

And the second commission in its report, page 12, says:

As to labor, which enters into the economy of a dockyard to a much greater extent than material, it would naturally gather in its vicinity without any impulse from without.

So that this point was carefully considered by each of the commissions before they recommended the establishment of a yard at this point. It is true that this yard is a short distance from the principal cities of Puget Sound. It is, however, only about 13 miles from Seattle. A boat can make the round trip in two hours. Tacoma and Everett are only about 20 miles distant, and in these three cities there is a population of at least 150,000 people, and at each of these cities there are large manufacturing and mechanical establishments from which an abundance of skilled labor can be secured at any time. At Seattle there is a large ship plant rapidly growing from which any number of skilled workmen can be secured. Here the torpedo boat *Rowan* was constructed; and this plant is ready to compete for the construction of any ship desired to be built by the United States. At Tacoma there are immense machine shops and other large factories. At Everett there are great wire-nail manufactories. And there can be no doubt whatever but that at these points abundance of skilled labor can be found to do any work necessary in a Government navy-yard.

As stated by the second commission, the establishment and development of a navy-yard will also naturally attract workmen, so that it would seem this objection is a captious one. Furthermore, it is an objection that could be urged against several of our navy-yards, especially Mare Island Navy-Yard, which is farther from San Francisco than Port Orchard is from Seattle, and yet the Bureau considers the location of Mare Island the best upon the Pacific coast from a strategic standpoint, "an excellent one with reference to the market for labor and supplies." In this connection I will notice the statement made by Mr. Endicott, that "when a naval vessel stood in need of docking and repair, skilled men have been supplied and transported, at great expense, from Mare Island Navy-Yard." This is true, but it will be noticed that he does not state that it was absolutely necessary to take these men from Mare Island. He does not state that they could not have been secured near the city, and I am satisfied that such could have been done and there would have been no difficulty whatever in securing just as competent men at Tacoma and Seattle, who would have done just as good work.

But I desire to quote from a letter from the Secretary of the Navy addressed to me and dated the 17th of May, 1900, relative to this matter. He says:

As to the complaint that skilled mechanics are brought to Puget Sound from California: It is not the intention of the Department to discriminate against resident mechanics and workmen. It is true that several years ago the Department appointed a board to investigate the subject of docking of merchant vessels at Puget Sound and to consider the question of procuring proper labor there. The board reported that no difficulty was to be expected in procuring sufficient skilled labor at short notice to dock the largest merchant vessel likely to require that service; but the chief constructor reported that until the station at Puget Sound is placed on a working basis, with a complete and competent organization, it will be necessary to send to that station at times a few experienced workmen, in order that the safety of heavy vessels of war may not be endangered while being docked.

It will thus be seen that it was reported to the Department that no difficulty might be expected in securing sufficient skilled labor at short notice to dock the largest merchant vessels likely to require that service. When the battle ship *Iowa* was sent to Puget Sound Station in 1899 for the purpose of having bilge keels fitted, the naval constructor of Mare Island was ordered to Puget Sound, together with 41 skilled mechanics, for the purpose of docking the vessel and fitting the bilge keels. While that was not necessary, it was done. But even this condition of affairs no longer exists, for the battle ship *Iowa* a short time ago was docked at this point without the assistance of any skilled mechanics or constructors from Mare Island, and in a letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, April 29, 1900, he states:

At the present docking, however, it will not be necessary to send any mechanics from Mare Island, the naval constructor at Puget Sound having

reported that men can now be obtained in the vicinity, this being the result of the development of the station.

The following account of the docking of the *Iowa* is taken from the Post-Intelligencer, published at Seattle:

The battle ship *Iowa* has just undergone one of the most successful dockings in the history of the United States Navy. She was put on the ways in Port Orchard dock, at Bremerton, at 3.30 o'clock yesterday afternoon, and is now in position to be thoroughly repaired. She will remain in the dock for several weeks, as there is much work to be done on her. At 5 o'clock the water in the dock had been lowered sufficiently to show that the vessel was properly on her blocks. This is the first time that a battle ship has been put into the dry dock at Bremerton without the aid of a naval constructor and employees from the Mare Island Yard, which the Government has heretofore believed to be necessary for such work. The operation was under the sole direction of Assistant Naval Constructor Homer Ferguson, who made all of the intricate arrangements for the docking and prepared the records from the beginning to the end of the enterprise.

It will thus be seen that one of the objections at least made by Admiral Endicott has passed away, and he can no longer claim that enough skilled men can not be secured and that skilled men must be supplied and transported at great expense from the Mare Island Navy-Yard.

Another objection that he makes is that the naval station is not situated near "a market with supplies convenient and quickly available," while, as I have stated, it is only an hour's run from Port Orchard to Seattle. Here railroad communication is had with three transcontinental lines, and supplies of all kinds can be purchased as cheaply—even more cheaply—in Seattle, Tacoma, or any of the other points on Puget Sound as at San Francisco and almost as cheaply as any city of the East. The Government always keeps its own cutters or tugboats, that can be used in transporting this material, so that this objection is only a surface one. Lumber and coal are produced in enormous quantities within easy reach of the station and can be purchased even cheaper than at any other point on the Pacific coast. In fact, San Francisco secures a great deal of its coal and lumber from the Puget Sound country. This point, however, was also considered by the other commissions. The first commission, in its report, speaks in regard to the station as somewhat removed from the centers of supplies and attached much weight to the necessity of transshipment by water of the supplies brought to the city by rail. It is admitted to be an inconvenience, but no more.

Port Orchard is distant by water from Seattle from 10 to 15 miles and from Tacoma double the distance. Accept this as an inconvenience, the conveniences and resources in the way of supplies of the rest of the Sound and of the whole Northwest are equally the resources of Port Orchard.

The next objection is that it has no "direct railroad connection with a trunk line for the quick and economical transport of material." This is true, but it is an objection that could be urged against some of the leading naval stations of the United States, and especially so against the naval station at Mare Island, a site declared by the Bureau to be the most excellent on the Pacific coast. It should be noted, however, that this station is on the mainland, so that railroad communication is not impossible. The present conditions also are very favorable toward railroad connection at no distant day in the future. Logging roads are already constructed a considerable distance toward this point, and a road is now being constructed from Port Angeles expecting to terminate at Olympia, and the construction of this road is only a question of time, and that it will touch at the naval station is without a doubt.

The second commission, in its report, says:

Port Orchard has at present no railway facilities, but as it is on the mainland the present railroad rivalry, so active in the Northwest, would at least speedily connect it with one or more of the great systems if permanent works were established there. But even without this advantage, the proposed site for the dry dock is but 13 miles from Seattle, the western terminus of two or more transcontinental lines, and all the materials required could be quickly and inexpensively transported by water.

This objection is considered as merely nominal, because transportation of materials, machinery, and supplies can be made on scows across the quiet waters of Puget Sound as readily as they have for years past been transported across New York Harbor and San Francisco Bay to the navy-yards there. There is no swell of the sea to contend with.

It will thus be seen that these objections of Admiral Endicott are without foundation. It is to be noted, however, that while he mentions these objections to this station, he does not mention its advantages. If these objections are without foundation, and it has all the other advantages necessary for a naval station, then this is the proper point at which to build a great navy-yard, because, as he states, the Bureau believes it to be important that a first-class naval station or yard should be equipped in this vicinity.

I desire to call the attention of Congress to the peculiar advantages of this station, and in so doing I desire to give you statements of those who are disinterested rather than statements of my own.

As before stated, two commissions have investigated this site and they have reported unanimously in its favor. They have

given us reasons at great length and they have summed up their reasons for selecting this site very briefly, and I desire to give you just what they say about it. On page 20 in the first report they state:

Port Orchard, on the contrary, admits the application to the utmost extent and in the least expensive manner of all the resources of the engineer. It is the citadel of Puget Sound, not to be reduced except by long and regular approaches, even if the outer defenses be forced and the rest of the Sound in the hands of an enemy. Suitably defended, it is safe both from a sudden dash and from distant bombardment by shipping. Within its ample limits not only the navy-yard but all the merchant shipping of the Sound can find a secure retreat; while with two natural cutlets, 10 miles apart and of ample depth, the ships of war can not be shut up, as they might by the injury of an artificial channel, but remain a constant threat to an enemy outside and a hindrance to any extensive operations farther up the Sound.

The commission closes this detailed description of the site selected by a summary of the conditions as found, corresponding to the requirements laid down by the Navy Department's letter of November 30, 1888 (page 6):

(1) The situation is upon a good harbor, with ample extent and depth of water for ships of the largest size and heaviest draft, and is accessible to them at all times.

(2) The principal lines of defense have not yet been laid down, but the opinion given by the commission as to their probable location coincides with the conclusions of the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, in his letter of April 27, 1888 (Fiftieth Congress, Senate Executive Document No. 105). The site chosen is well within any probable line of defenses intended to cover the principal cities of Puget Sound. It may be added that it is also favorably situated to support that line of defense while itself remaining secure.

(3) Its position and natural surroundings are such as to afford ample local security from attack by naval force, whether by dash or bombardment, with unusually small expense in preparation of defenses. The northern entrance, Agate Passage, is exceedingly narrow, and, while possessing sufficient depth for the heaviest ships at quarter flood, can be filled with submarine mines. In this direction 11 miles is the shortest distance to which an enemy can approach the yard. The southern entrance, Richs Passage, makes at Point Glover a sharp bend of 110 degrees in its course from the Sound to Port Orchard. Its shores are lined by bluffs, which, though often of moderate elevation, give both enfilading and plunging fire upon a passing vessel, and which extend over so long a line as to admit of guns being massed or dispersed, as may seem most advisable. This passage is 3 miles long and nowhere wider from shore to shore than 1,500 yards. At the throat for a mile it contracts to 700 yards, and the water throughout, though deeper than desirable with the current, will admit of torpedo defenses.

Two miles outside of Richs Passage, in the Sound, and almost mathematically in the center of the deep bight between Bainbridge and Vashon Island, lies Blake Island, over 200 feet high and with slopes favorable to fortifications, which possesses all the advantages of an advanced post without the weaknesses of a salient, both flanks and rear being covered by the coast line, generally high, extending from Restoration Point, by Point Orchard, to Vashon Island, and nowhere more than 2 miles distant from Blake Island. Such conditions make it impossible for a fleet to surround the latter with a converging fire. By occupying the line indicated, and assuming that a fleet intent upon bombarding an unseen distant object—a task which demands great precision and some immunity from molestation—will not lie nearer than 2 miles to batteries with plunging fire, the yard is found to be over 8 miles distant from a possible enemy. If an attempt at bombardment be made from lower down Admiralty Inlet to the east of Bainbridge Island, the heights there are equally favorable to defense; and, even if unoccupied, the nearest approach there to Point Turner is 7 miles, with very high ground intervening. More favorable conditions of position and natural surroundings against naval attack, under the supposition of the principal line of defense to Puget Sound being forced, can rarely be found.

(4) The water front on Sinclair Harbor is a mile and a half long, which, after all deductions for dry docks, building slips, etc., will allow at least a dozen of the heaviest ships known to lie at the docks in a single tier. The commission considers that the water front on the entrance to Dyes Inlet (Port Washington Narrows) can be used for lighter vessels if more space is needed. The current, though strong, will not prevent this. The two fronts together give a water front of 6½ miles.

(5) The position with respect to lines of interior communication has already been incidentally but fully discussed. It is not as good as could be desired, but the defect amounts at worst to a present inconvenience. The site is on the mainland and can be connected with the railroad systems. By water it is in easy communication with all the resources of the country.

(6) From want of money it has not been possible to make an exhaustive examination of the site with reference to its fitness for supporting heavy structures and for excavations. It has the general external characteristics of the Puget Sound country, the surface indications are favorable, and the borings are thought to promise satisfactory results. The commission believes that the ground will be found suitable for the purposes named.

(7) The site is 15 miles from Seattle, 30 from Tacoma, the principal centers of labor and supplies upon Puget Sound. Both labor and supplies can be obtained from those cities.

(8) The climate is the same as that of Puget Sound generally. There is a large amount of rainfall throughout this region, though much more in some places than in others, and the same remark is true of the Columbia; but a distinguishing feature of the climate as compared with the Atlantic coast is the small range of temperature and consequent freedom from extremes of either heat or cold. All accounts agree in the natural healthfulness of the region generally, and that outdoor labor can be carried on throughout the year with the loss of very few days.

(9) The few and scattered settlers now on Point Turner obtain water from wells or small springs. There is little doubt that wells would supply all the wants of a yard; but to set at rest even that small doubt, the commission examined Lake Kitsap, 3 miles from the proposed site. The lake was found by two barometrical observations to be 120 and 145 feet above high water; mean, 137 feet. A specimen of the water was taken, and pronounced to be wholesome and potable by one of the leading physicians of Seattle. From an examination of the outlet a rough estimate was reached that 337,000 gallons of water hourly passed from the lake. This result was purposely based upon the lowest estimates of depth and velocity of the stream. The lake is a mile long by a third of a mile wide. Soundings were taken at the head and mid-way the length, in both cases near the axis of the lake; 9 feet were found at the former place and 27 at the latter. A settler on the shore stated that in the dry season the lake fell about 6 inches.

A later official measurement shows the supply of water to be over 800,000 gallons per day.

The commission considers it certain that, with Lake Kitsap in reserve, there can always be had a sufficient supply of drinking water. With a view to facilitate the use of the water of the lake by the Government, the commission submit the convenience of obtaining a lot (No. 6, section 17) bordering upon it, which was valued and appraised in the same way as the lots constituting the site selected, the results being in the table appended. Throughout the great peninsula south and west of Point Turner the map shows numerous streams and ponds.

The commission will add that the general surface of the country in the Puget Sound region reflects the depth, abruptness, and irregularity of the soundings. In a personal examination which extended over nearly five weeks, during which the whole shore was passed in review, there was opportunity to observe the generally broken character of the ground. Places presenting an approach to the level surface desired for a navy-yard, and of sufficient extent, were relatively very rare. The commission had, therefore, no hesitation in accepting a certain amount of high land, provided the necessary level or practicable ground conveniently disposed was found associated with it. The same natural conditions compelled the commission to recommend the obtaining of an unusually large area in order to make sure of the necessary space; but the size of this area and the central location of the higher ground will permit the disposal of the various accessories of a navy-yard and stations, such as marine barracks, hospital, officers' quarters, etc., in a manner convenient, compact, and yet not contracted, to a degree that is rarely realized elsewhere.

In the sixth paragraph of this summary it is stated that—

From want of money it has not been possible to make an exhaustive examination of site with reference to its fitness for supporting heavy structures and for excavations, etc.

The experience of the Government, however, in the construction of its dry dock at this point has fully verified the opinion of this commission in the adaptability of this site for sustaining heavy structures. The dry dock as constructed has been found to be one of the most efficient dry docks, if not the most efficient, in the United States. The battle ship *Oregon* was docked here prior to her trip around the Horn, and measurements taken before and after the docking show that it did not shrink or bulge the thousandth part of an inch. Since that time the battle ship *Iowa* has been docked with equal success and is again resting securely and safely within the dock.

This is a record very different from that of many of the other docks of the country. The dock at Mare Island has not been used because a vessel could not get to it. The Port Royal dock was so badly thrown out of plumb by the battle ship *Indiana* that the Department was very fearful lest it would not be able to get the ship out, and \$500,000 is the sum recommended by the Department as needed for repairs.

Again, it must be noted that the facilities for anchoring vessels is better here than in any other yard in the country. There is scarcely a yard for which the Naval Bureau does not recommend dredging in front of the wharves in order to secure sufficient depth for vessels to lie at anchor. The space available for this purpose in nearly all the yards is very limited and at most of them must be artificially created. At the Port Orchard Station the situation is entirely different, and in the report of the first commission, on page 23, it is stated:

The site will afford 1½ miles of water front on Sinclair Inlet, and on the whole shore line can give between 6 and 7 miles, while the anchorage ground directly in front of it, in less than 10 fathoms and more than 4, is 1½ square miles.

There are upon Sinclair Inlet within the limits of the site two low basins, the beds of very small streams, named provisionally Jertsen and Williams basins, both of which will be available for the excavation of dry docks. The former is 1,800 feet wide and extends back with that width three-quarters of a mile from shore. In Williams Basin the front is 1,400 feet wide and extends back about the same distance (1,400 feet), contracting to a point.

It may be added that on Dyes Inlet Narrows there is a deep bight within the site, well adapted for ships laid up in ordinary.

The second commission thus describes it:

Once inside the Narrows, at Point Glover, Port Orchard has a total length of 13 miles from Agate Pass to the head of Sinclair Inlet, with an average width of three-quarters of a mile and a depth (with a few deep holes of 20 fathoms) of about 14 fathoms, lessening to 6 fathoms in Sinclair Inlet. Not a rock or shoal obstructs this magnificent sheet of water through its total length.

Comparing it with the usual great depths of all the estuaries of Puget Sound, it is a phenomenon. A fleet of the largest ships could be maneuvered within its limits with ease, and anchored anywhere without difficulty. It is doubtful if an equal area of clear water of moderate depth and an entrance of but a quarter of a mile wide could be found in this country or elsewhere.

No money need be appropriated for artificial basins in which to store vessels. No money need be appropriated for dredging a channel so that vessels can approach the station. Twenty thousand dollars was appropriated for dredging a couple of years ago; but the Secretary, in a letter to me May 17, 1899, says:

The appropriation for dredging is not being expended, as the commandant of the station states that none is necessary at the present time.

The water contains no sediment to deposit and is without current save the tide. Every dollar appropriated for this station can be used in the actual construction, equipment, and maintenance of the navy-yard. None of it need be used for providing artificially what should be found naturally. All through the reports of the Secretary of the Navy are found recommendations for appropriations for the different yards for dredging a channel to the yard or for dredging out a basin for the ships and for such similar purposes. If the greatest amount for such purposes used at any one yard were appropriated and expended at Port Orchard, it

would soon be one of the best equipped stations in the United States.

Simply for illustration, take the Mare Island Station. No large battle ship can reach it. All vessels must pass through San Pablo Bay. There are shoals in the channel for a distance of almost 5 miles, so that its depth at low water is only about 18 feet and at high water only about 23½ feet. In order to secure a channel 30 feet deep it is necessary to remove over 2,721,000 cubic yards of material. To do this it will cost not less than \$381,000. When the channel is once dredged, there is no assurance that it will not fill up again, and there is likely to be needed an annual appropriation the amount of which no one can tell and estimated at not less than \$16,000, for maintaining the depth.

In dredging a basin and channel through the Mare Island Straits at this yard nearly \$300,000 was expended from September 1, 1897, to July 1, 1898, and in the report for 1899 \$100,000 more was asked for, and that amount was placed in the naval bill as it passed the House this session, making over \$300,000 for that purpose alone, and the end is not in sight.

In his report for 1899 Admiral Endicott also makes this statement relative to a deep-water basin, preparatory, I suppose, to asking for an appropriation for that purpose:

The construction of a basin within the line of the water front is regarded as an improvement which should be made at this yard in order to give more room for berthing vessels, when under repairs or fitting out, in a position where they would be more conveniently accessible from the working shops than it is now possible to locate them. This basin would practically be a slip, and the necessity for such provisions is being demonstrated at other yards, as well as at Mare Island. Many of the vessels owned by the Government are very long, and when berthed on the water front parallel with the stream it has been found impossible to locate them so as to be conveniently reached for repairs or transport of stores, because the fronts will accommodate only a few vessels so disposed unless they are laid two or more abreast.

Contrast this with the material advantages before mentioned at Port Orchard.

I present herewith a statement of the expenditures at Mare Island since its establishment by the Bureau of Yards and Docks. It gives only the amounts expended under the Bureau of Yards and Docks and consequently does not give the full amount. There is enough, however.

Memorandum showing total expenditures at navy-yard, Mare Island, by fiscal years, from 1854, date of establishing yard, to 1899.

Fiscal year ending June 30—	Total expenditures.	Fiscal year ending June 30—	Total expenditures.
1855.....	\$252,504.89	1879.....	\$114,221.25
1856.....	408,766.98	1880.....	126,720.15
1857.....	391,633.89	1881.....	247,198.48
1858.....	475,463.58	1882.....	301,511.45
1859.....	254,821.90	1883.....	303,562.55
1860.....	216,122.29	1884.....	321,472.06
1861.....	120,403.95	1885.....	303,433.35
1862.....	280,814.01	1886.....	332,871.64
1863.....	385,969.37	1887.....	202,782.60
1864.....	440,306.30	1888.....	241,601.24
1865.....	340,310.01	1889.....	193,068.53
1866.....	371,875.54	1890.....	190,386.84
1867.....	464,866.07	1891.....	183,093.42
1868.....	245,848.75	1892.....	193,032.45
1869.....	253,624.71	1893.....	129,193.18
1870.....	253,699.43	1894.....	192,503.13
1871.....	233,297.34	1895.....	211,310.78
1872.....	276,563.64	1896.....	175,698.86
1873.....	505,139.04	1897.....	215,953.80
1874.....	575,558.29	1898.....	401,900.80
1875.....	416,511.14	1899.....	408,303.76
1876.....	386,358.60		
1877.....	123,942.99	Total.....	12,753,072.73
1878.....	93,660.11		

Since July 1, 1889, all expenditures were placed in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, and the following statement shows the total expenditures since that time:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS, NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, D. C., April 24, 1900.

Statement showing expenditures under all departments at navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal., since July 1, 1889.

Year.	Amount.	Year.	Amount.
1890.....	\$427,482.16	1896.....	\$269,848.84
1891.....	515,153.44	1897.....	439,167.24
1892.....	467,368.92	1898.....	674,349.91
1893.....	357,690.82	1899.....	862,007.88
1894.....	427,398.17	1900 (to December 31, 1899).....	576,280.17
1895.....	331,577.12		

The expenditures for the current fiscal year up to May 1 amount to \$357,671.74. These statements are furnished me by the Navy Department. In 1898 an earthquake also occurred that did great damage at Mare Island. It cost \$350,000 for repairs, and there is no telling when another one will occur.

The following statement, furnished by the Navy Department, shows the total expenditures at all the yards and docks in the United States since 1889.

Statement showing all expenditures for improvements, maintenance, and machinery plants at each Government navy-yard and naval station in the United States from July 1, 1889, to June 30, 1899, being the fiscal years of 1890 to 1899, inclusive.

	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	Total.
Portsmouth, N. H.:											
Real estate and chattels.....		\$63,882.22	\$83,519.16	\$16,765.06	\$12,992.90	\$6,035.34	\$644.72	\$1,434.46	\$3,992.56	\$15,655.72	
Machinery plant.....	\$762.81	1,324.98	41,998.09	22,438.58	23,803.91	1,969.01	16,390.37	6,686.38	440.37	23,787.45	
Maintenance of yard.....	98,194.43	175,990.91	125,435.02	147,286.12	103,328.22	75,219.47	93,680.39	120,842.27	123,751.20	184,496.60	
Total.....	98,957.24	241,198.11	250,952.27	186,490.36	140,125.03	82,253.82	110,715.48	128,963.11	128,184.13	223,939.83	\$1,592,779.38
Boston, Mass.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	25,706.14	11,822.78	59,284.89	24,766.20	4,251.12	25,789.60	3,545.10	14,759.50	2,640.06	34,904.65	
Machinery plant.....	31,839.64	31,839.64	115,811.52	50,064.83	20,793.28	6,060.04	9,349.02	8,306.70	13,899.02	117,022.83	
Maintenance of yard.....	105,578.98	170,104.41	167,332.34	190,847.31	198,440.07	155,648.65	143,146.33	155,758.62	268,418.36	555,232.90	
Total.....	181,085.12	213,766.83	342,428.75	265,678.34	223,484.47	187,498.29	156,040.45	178,824.82	284,957.44	707,160.38	2,690,924.89
Naval station, Newport:											
Real estate and chattels.....	7,150.00	7,210.64	86,660.26	24,206.41	19,576.92	31,415.64	32,635.98	26,835.71	15,988.55	27,689.77	
Machinery plant.....	206.35		1,802.24	1,719.21	19,306.66	8,209.61	11,572.56	3,477.60	5,108.13	3,231.48	
Maintenance of station.....	85,201.21	65,795.04	68,132.57	93,416.37	120,934.75	123,900.55	111,185.99	126,436.34	120,681.92	137,772.44	
Total.....	92,557.56	73,005.68	156,595.07	119,341.99	159,818.33	163,525.80	155,394.53	156,749.65	141,778.60	168,693.69	1,387,460.90
Naval station, New London:											
Real estate and chattels.....		4,059.85	1,713.20	1,827.52		78.00	41.24	209.78	6,981.79	36,962.76	
Machinery plant.....		2,936.16									
Maintenance of station.....	9,229.77	30,443.18	18,505.98	13,618.66	11,797.23	10,992.60	11,205.65	10,706.67	12,296.41	9,596.89	
Total.....	9,229.77	37,439.19	20,219.18	15,446.18	11,797.23	11,070.60	11,246.89	10,916.45	19,278.20	46,559.65	193,203.34
Brooklyn, N. Y.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	323,239.54	165,364.90	255,456.98	197,753.62	190,502.31	80,961.50	548,547.64	374,243.00	293,990.53	273,690.65	
Machinery plant.....	99,779.13	170,103.08	82,757.00	68,158.11	45,469.03	13,914.47	19,033.38	42,561.72	33,624.36	323,016.98	
Maintenance of yard.....	350,394.55	376,074.82	414,128.55	481,318.97	412,260.56	341,897.18	592,165.17	697,623.16	764,789.35	1,360,509.95	
Total.....	773,413.22	711,542.80	752,342.53	747,230.70	648,231.90	436,773.15	1,159,746.19	1,114,427.88	1,092,404.24	1,957,216.98	9,393,329.50
League Island, Pa.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	297,866.56	280,070.36	158,715.75	115,191.96	105,451.44	58,319.86	74,904.58	49,261.29	85,085.15	97,613.21	
Machinery plant.....		775.28	43,678.01	12,156.50	31,013.65	10,993.22	686.38	3,214.33	6,195.56	5,747.78	
Maintenance of yard.....	96,161.23	128,194.91	188,699.55	176,932.79	143,586.03	145,509.89	163,737.46	159,970.75	281,620.12	485,388.38	
Total.....	394,027.79	409,040.55	391,093.31	353,281.25	280,051.12	214,822.97	239,328.42	242,446.37	372,900.83	588,749.37	5,435,741.98
Naval Academy, Annapolis:											
Real estate and chattels.....	19,181.93	2,218.91	32,971.65	15,161.65	33,485.85	35,804.07	4,862.83	57,173.72	12,238.60	139,719.39	
Machinery plant.....		612.41	4,187.52	5,544.53	10,193.86		4,010.52	1,524.40			
Maintenance of Academy.....	135,705.29	112,436.50	206,624.98	208,758.78	191,420.83	215,137.41	200,331.78	230,060.30	230,765.09	250,657.39	
Total.....	154,895.22	115,267.82	243,784.15	229,464.96	235,100.54	250,941.48	209,205.13	288,758.42	293,003.69	390,376.78	2,410,798.19
Washington, D. C.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	174,360.91	87,240.56	59,735.56	37,654.44	73,032.86	54,207.94	38,161.72	116,760.11	76,851.89	140,189.75	
Machinery plant.....	159,391.60	402,594.70	484,967.60	270,379.66	219,077.95	84,647.19	203,522.25	75,675.49	48,272.85	447,434.95	
Maintenance of yard.....	98,486.35	195,612.69	183,501.68	258,146.23	279,769.73	248,921.53	263,858.75	203,340.68	296,744.44	452,729.22	
Total.....	432,238.86	685,447.95	728,204.84	566,180.33	571,880.34	387,776.66	505,542.72	395,776.28	421,869.18	1,040,353.92	5,735,171.08
Proving ground, Maryland:											
Real estate and chattels.....	9,020.00	13,964.98	20,408.17	16,227.05	34,941.27	6,629.81	14,343.23	4,087.41	1,680.85	139,665.45	
Machinery plant.....			533.89	3,598.93	3,204.38	174.36			738.52	10,551.85	
Maintenance of proving ground.....	47,047.79	53,779.25	22,892.01	23,901.04	32,638.47	36,965.12	21,010.14	26,279.31	19,608.52	36,183.96	
Total.....	56,067.79	67,744.23	43,834.07	43,727.02	70,784.12	43,799.29	35,353.37	30,366.72	22,027.89	186,401.26	600,105.76
Norfolk, Va.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	190,676.71	24,829.41	86,774.70	69,784.65	69,563.64	75,507.74	89,247.74	69,902.31	117,621.19	89,751.79	
Machinery plant.....	38,135.36	86,068.54	21,404.67	8,405.11			544.61	7,504.64	1,321.18	112,783.00	
Maintenance of yard.....	165,293.62	193,062.86	230,015.66	211,104.57	205,149.31	211,435.62	208,765.63	302,031.07	444,581.84	721,368.70	
Total.....	394,105.69	303,960.81	338,195.03	289,354.33	274,712.95	286,943.26	388,557.98	379,438.02	563,524.21	923,903.49	4,142,695.27
Port Royal, S. C.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	215.00	5,374.06	140,224.97	163,061.51	112,018.34	68,611.32	82,613.16	69,201.41	37,150.72	95,911.80	
Machinery plant.....					802.50				12,889.69	28,666.64	
Maintenance of station.....	3,820.25	2,954.38	5,186.69	10,602.50	13,359.78	12,708.75	52,106.59	24,510.08	119,378.15	196,352.36	
Total.....	4,035.25	8,328.44	145,411.66	173,664.01	126,270.62	81,320.07	134,719.75	93,711.49	168,918.56	320,930.80	1,257,310.65
Key West, Fla.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	34,240.10	6,610.20	550.00	24.00		794.69	27,446.63	17,661.79	94,490.90	460,143.24	
Machinery plant.....							148.57		2,142.79	23,738.21	
Maintenance of station.....	8,155.25	17,016.89	11,039.70	10,731.86	9,542.50	14,542.84	20,862.29	15,579.39	64,495.03	319,783.15	
Total.....	42,395.35	23,627.09	11,579.70	10,755.86	9,542.50	15,337.53	48,455.49	33,241.18	161,128.72	803,664.60	1,159,728.02
Pensacola, Fla.:											
Real estate and chattels.....		19,177.47	651.70	98.00		800.00	672.91	337.75	2,447.25	110,133.71	
Maintenance of yard.....	34,483.84	40,839.98	34,419.40	34,455.87	36,804.16	38,541.48	38,537.64	37,811.29	63,861.24	134,438.27	
Total.....	34,483.84	60,011.45	35,071.10	34,553.87	36,804.16	39,341.48	39,210.55	38,149.04	66,308.49	244,591.98	628,525.96
Mare Island, Cal.:											
Real estate and chattels.....	98,556.78	105,784.68	89,124.63	54,171.92	89,473.74	42,296.18	65,808.70	87,644.85	103,711.19	146,111.13	
Machinery plant.....	1,570.74	10,607.83	117,672.14	41,964.27	78,643.15	7,368.94	249.68	14,290.01	39,529.85	84,813.91	
Maintenance of yard.....	327,354.64	298,867.93	290,572.15	256,861.13	259,281.28	281,912.00	303,790.47	394,220.78	531,101.89	629,348.79	
Total.....	427,482.16	415,160.44	497,368.92	352,907.32	427,398.17	331,577.12	369,848.85	436,155.64	674,339.93	860,273.83	4,762,602.38
Puget Sound, Wash.:											
Real estate and chattels.....				36,513.43	222,247.51	271,240.46	130,462.64	83,339.25	87,063.58	46,205.63	
Machinery plant.....									1,092.00	15,908.68	
Maintenance of station.....			159.33	7,141.91	5,540.10	7,452.59	30,673.96	33,585.50	33,726.47	53,778.21	
Total.....			159.33	43,655.34	227,787.61	278,693.05	161,136.60	116,924.75	121,882.05	115,892.52	1,066,131.25

Statement showing all expenditures for improvements, maintenance, and machinery plants at each Government navy-yard and naval station in the United States from July 1, 1889, to June 30, 1899, being the fiscal years of 1890 to 1899, inclusive—Continued.

	1890.	1891.	1892.	1893.	1894.	1895.	1896.	1897.	1898.	1899.	Total.
Dry dock, Algiers, La., dock						\$45,577.93					\$45,577.93
Training station, San Francisco:											
Real estate and chattels										\$16,223.16	
Maintenance of station										699.63	
Total										16,922.79	16,922.79
Grand total											40,519,009.36

The advantages of Port Orchard for a navy-yard are clearly and briefly set out in the report of the second commission, from which I quote:

- (1) Easy ingress or egress by day or by night and a channel free from natural obstructions.
- (2) Perfect defensibility through a moderately narrow channel that can be made impregnable by submarine mines and inexpensive fortifications.
- (3) Large areas of level and practicable ground.
- (4) Extensive water front and sufficiently bold.
- (5) A capacious harbor, with an even depth of from 5 to 7 fathoms.
- (6) In Lake Kitsap an abundant supply of excellent fresh water, sufficient for all the requirements of an extensive plant.
- (7) Easy and convenient water communication with commercial centers.
- (8) Proximity to outer line of defenses of Puget Sound, from which it is distant but three or four hours' steaming.
- (9) Port of refuge for the commercial marine.

I have thus set out the data from which comparisons can be made and conclusions drawn relative to our navy-yard. To my mind it is clear that Port Orchard is not only the best site on the Pacific coast, but it is the best and most economical site in the United States. Here can be constructed and operated a great navy-yard at the least cost and expense to the Government. It is the best base from which to operate the navy of the Pacific. It is near Alaska, within the great commercial center of the Northwest, a thousand miles nearer Manila than Mare Island, and accessible to any and all vessels at all times.

Not only is this State rich in those natural advantages which will produce prosperity, wealth, and power, but it is rich in those natural features which please, elevate, and inspire. He who seeks the pleasures of nature can find them here. It is not necessary to go to Switzerland to see beautiful lakes or magnificent mountains. It is not necessary to go to the Alps or the Apennines to see the grand and sublime. It is not necessary to go to Scotland to see beautiful fens and dells. All, and more, can be seen here. Great rivers flow majestically to the sea—now rolling over great rocks and boulders; now moving peacefully in a broad channel bordered with lofty mountains clad in perpetual green; now rushing with irresistible power through narrow channels cut through solid rock, and then sweeping boldly into the sea.

Beautiful lakes nestle in the mountains. Their waters, clear as crystal, from whose placid depths wave back the rustling evergreens around their borders are disturbed only by the leaping trout or fluttering fly or mosquito. Beautiful dells and fens, dales and valleys, coves and glens nestle among her hills and mountains, inviting the weary to peace, rest, and solitude. Dashing streams of water, clear and sparkling, glance along the mountain side or gurgle and murmur through vale and glen, anon leaping over rocks or dashing madly against great boulders, leaping and tumbling in billowy falls over cliff and crag, making rainbows of the sunbeams, and dimpling and sparkling as onward they go, hiding now and then in some quiet pool, until at last the desert's thirst is quenched and beauteous vegetation covers the earth. Within shady dells and along lofty mountain sides "flowers spring up unknown and die ungathered." Great fields of ice and snow glitter in the summer's sun and mighty glaciers, seamed and crevassed by ages, move onward slowly and majestically, ever receding.

Four great mountains lift their heads to the skies, white-capped with eternal snows, till they "meet the sun in his coming and the earliest light in the morning gilds their hoary tops, and parting day lingers and stays on their summits." The sportsman finds here his paradise. The restive deer browse quietly in shady glades and retreats. The great elk, moose, and caribou rest in the darksome depths of the dense forests. Along mountain peak and rocky crag leap and skip the mountain sheep and goat. The wild-cat, panther, jaguar, and bear haunt the wilds and furnish sport for the adventurous. To the golden field come thousands of wild geese "honking" from the north, and to the lakes and bayous millions of duck. The "lordly salmon" sports festively in the rivers and arms of the sea, "and swift trout, diversified with crimson stains," leap and dart in the mountain streams and lakes and lie glittering in dark, silent pools. Here the lover of nature

can satisfy his longings and revel in the delights of the beautiful, awesome, and sublime.

Thou who would see the lovely and wild
Mingling in harmony with nature's face.
Ascend our Rocky Mountains. Let thy foot
Fail not in weariness, for on their tops
The beauty and the majesty of life.
Spread wide beneath, shall make thee to forget
The steep and toilsome way.

As Washington heads the list of our nation's great, so will the State of Washington head the list of our nation's Commonwealths. Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GREEN] such time as he may desire.

[Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

[Mr. HENRY C. SMITH addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CAPRON. I will ask the gentleman on the other side to consume the balance of his time.

Mr. SULZER. How much time have we on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has twenty-three minutes. Mr. SULZER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. DENNY].

[Mr. DENNY addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CAPRON. We have no desire to occupy more time on this side.

Mr. SULZER. How much time have we remaining on this side?

The CHAIRMAN. Nineteen minutes.

[Mr. SULZER addressed the committee. See Appendix.]

Mr. CAPRON. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC].

Mr. SHATTUC. Mr. Chairman, I had the pleasure of recently having read to this House an appreciative poetical effort, sent me by a Democratic constituent, entitled "The Seeds That Never Grow." The publication by the press of that poem has inspired some of my Republican friends with the muse, one of whom sends me the following excellent tribute to "The Seeds That Always Grow." The author, Mr. T. C. Harbaugh, is an Ohio man and a Republican, both of which attributes guarantee the excellence of the production, which the Clerk will now please read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Dear Uncle Samuel, hear my plea,
Give ear unto my needs,
My little garden waiteth for
Its annual lot of seeds.
Don't bunco me as in the past,
When vain I plied the hoe,
But see that I am well supplied
With seeds that always grow.

My sprinkler, with new coat of paint,
Is ready for its toil,
And I am waiting at the fence,
A tiller of the soil;
My eyes are turned toward Washington
Don't fill my heart with woe,
But let the postman bring to me
The seeds that always grow.

And let the seeds be "true to name,"
No matter what it be;
Don't let the package labeled "Squash"
Be pumpkins small to see;
And when I go to view my patch
With sprinkler and with hoe,
Oh, let me bless the hand that sends
The seeds that always grow.

I try to serve my country well,
I cater to her needs,
And my reward is ample, though
'Tis but a pack of seeds;
Then fill a patriot's heart with joy,
Nor burden it with woe,
And let his eye behold the seeds
That never fail to grow.

How oft I've planted from your hand,
Out in the springtime air,
The seeds that rotted in the ground,
And often made me swear;
Let me be quick to hail your worth,
And unto anger slow;
And let my patch rejoice to sprout
The seeds that always grow.

Dear Uncle Sam, don't let me plant
Some seeds you shovel out,
They're like some Presidential booms
That never even sprout;
But let me with a cheerful smile
Unto my neighbors go,
And tell them often all about
The seeds that always grow.

Mr. CAPRON. Mr. Chairman, we do not desire to occupy further time.

Mr. SULZER. If the gentleman has nothing more to say, I suggest that the poem of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SHATTUC] be referred to Colonel DICK, of his own State.

Mr. SHATTUC. What was the remark of my friend? I did not understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON] has been recognized.

Mr. CAPRON. I ask that the reading of the bill for amendment under the five-minute rule be now commenced.

The Clerk, proceeding to read the bill, read the following:

For pay of 808 cadets, at \$540 each, \$185,000.

Mr. CAPRON. On the first page of the bill, on line 28, there is a typographical error. The words "three hundred and eight" should be "three hundred and eighty-one." I move to amend the bill by striking out "eight" and inserting "eighty-one."

Mr. McRAE. I suggest to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON] that the phraseology specifying the number of cadets should be stricken out. We should not attempt to limit the appropriation to any certain number of cadets. We do not know how long the number will continue the same. We should appropriate simply for the pay of cadets, which is, I think, the usual form of appropriation. The language of the present bill, I think, is new. I move to strike out the words seeking to limit the number of cadets.

Mr. CAPRON. Three hundred and eighty-one is the number of cadets now permitted to be at the Academy by law. There can not be more than that number.

Mr. McRAE. But there may be less.

Mr. CAPRON. Yes; there may be less, in which case, of course, the full amount of the appropriation would not be used. I am told that the language now in the bill has been customary in years past.

Mr. McRAE. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I think we have not heretofore specified the number of cadets, but have simply made an appropriation "for pay of cadets."

Mr. MARSH. Allow me to say to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] that this is not new phraseology, but is in the usual form.

Mr. CAPRON. I have here the last appropriation bill, and it reads "for pay of 371 cadets." This year the number is 381, because an additional number of cadets has been provided for by law.

Mr. McRAE. But we have not now at the Academy the full number of cadets that may be there.

Mr. CAPRON. Oh, no. On account of sickness and other reasons it is always impossible to tell what will be the exact number.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE], as the Chair understands, does not insist on his amendment?

Mr. McRAE. No, sir.

Mr. HULL. This discussion turns on an immaterial matter. We simply provide for the number of cadets authorized by law without regard to the number that may be actually in attendance, and do not appropriate for the full number. This bill appropriates for 36 less than the full number.

Mr. McRAE. I think it would be better to make the appropriation "for pay of cadets" without undertaking to specify the number.

Mr. HULL. It does not make any practical difference. We are following the universal practice in adopting the provision in the form reported.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. CAPRON].

The amendment was adopted.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of 1 line officer on duty in Quartermaster's Department in addition to pay as first lieutenant, mounted, \$400.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the provision of the bill embraced in lines 6, 7, and 8, on the page just read, but will reserve it to ask the chairman of the committee why it is necessary to make provision for this compensation in lieu of the existing law?

Mr. HULL. I will state to the gentleman from Arkansas that a line officer is on duty there now. This is to a certain extent a

change in the law, but I do not think it is amenable to the point of order, because the service is already authorized.

Mr. McRAE. Does this increase the compensation?

Mr. HULL. Of course, if the officer who is assigned to this duty enters upon the service there he receives the additional pay, as this provision specifies.

Mr. McRAE. What is the difference in the compensation?

Mr. HULL. Well, it is the difference between the pay of a lieutenant and a captain, a very small difference.

Mr. McRAE. What is the difference in amount?

Mr. HULL. The difference is small. The provision to which reference is made in the bill shows clearly what it is.

Mr. McRAE. This seems to be a provision to put a new man into that position and pay him a very much larger compensation than he has been heretofore receiving in the line as an officer in the Quartermaster's Department.

Mr. HULL. Of course an officer placed in this position would be necessarily compelled to pay extra expenses on his own account. There is no reason why, when an officer is so detailed for duty, he should not receive extra compensation in order to meet the expenses he must incur. The Superintendent of the Academy thought it necessary, and justice to all parties seems to require that this provision be inserted in the bill. If the line officer now there did not discharge these duties in addition to his work as such line officer we would have to pay for an extra officer.

Mr. McRAE. I do not insist, Mr. Chairman, upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of military band, 12 enlisted musicians, at \$34 per month, \$4,896.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask why this change is made as it appears in line 24, with reference to the pay of enlisted musicians in the military band, and why this large increase in the number of musicians?

Mr. HULL. This has been found necessary because of the fact that men after they had become educated in these positions in the band are often tempted to accept occupation outside. They receive now only the pay of privates. This makes an increase only of 16 pieces in the band—that is to say, 16 new men. The committee, on a careful consideration of the matter, have decided that this suggestion with reference to the improvement of the band is necessary.

The Superintendent of the Academy is anxious to make the provision because of the conditions prevailing with reference to the membership of the band, and the committee, on hearing fully all of the suggestions which were submitted with reference to the matter, have decided in favor of the provision and agreed to give to the Academy what seems so necessary. I think myself that the country will acquiesce in the suggestion to give there a band commensurate with the necessities of the service—a better or larger band than that which they have had heretofore.

Mr. McRAE. I can not concur with the gentleman from Iowa in his suggestion as to the policy of increasing the number of the musicians in the band at the Military Academy. This is quite a very large increase in the number of musicians employed there—in other words, an increase of 16 members, as I understand this provision. I wish to call attention to this unreasonable increase, and to enter my protest against it.

Mr. HULL. There is an increase, as the gentleman from Arkansas says, of the number of men in the band over and above what was heretofore allowed. But there is a difference in the grouping of these employees, and there is not a very large increase in the pay, taking it as a whole. It is important that this provision should be inserted in the bill, because of the fact that while these men are being educated in music at the Academy as members of the band, they are afterwards frequently withdrawn from the service by the temptation of higher pay in private bands, and this provision is inserted here for the purpose of securing suitable persons and, as far as possible, protecting the Government.

The committee regard it as highly important that this should be inserted for the protection of the service.

Mr. McRAE. But you increase the number here and make it harder to keep them. If you can not get the requisite number of trained musicians now, it will be harder to get more when the number is increased. We should not educate or train musicians if we can not retain them when required.

Mr. HULL. Oh, well, we provide for that. We pay them more.

Mr. McRAE. Yes; and while we pay them more, you propose this unnecessary increase in the number, to be paid for at public expense.

The Clerk read as follows:

Two cooks, \$432;
Seven corporals, \$1,260.

Mr. McRAE. I want to ask the gentleman from Iowa if the item in line 23, on page 4, is usually carried in this bill?

Mr. HULL. That is the usual appropriation.

Mr. McRAE. Are these officers generally provided for?

Mr. HULL. Always. Of course the list is changed somewhat on account of the two cooks that were authorized by the general law passed during the last Congress.

Mr. McRAE. I speak of the seven corporals.

Mr. HULL. I think that is the usual number. It is the number provided for the detachment that is on duty there.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of artillery detachment: One first sergeant, \$300;
Three sergeants, \$648;
One cook, \$216;
Three corporals, \$510.

Mr. McRAE. For the purpose of getting an explanation, I make the point of order against this.

Mr. HULL. There is no question but that this is new; but I want to say to the gentleman from Arkansas that it does not increase the expense to the Government, except the difference between the pay of the privates and of the noncommissioned officers. That amounts to \$570; but the extra-duty pay of the detachment which has been carried heretofore amounts to \$560; so that there is only a net increase of expense to the Government of \$10. It does not require this number of men as an addition to the Army, but takes them out of the present artillery force.

The reason for it is this: Up to this time the cavalry detachment has always had to do the work of an artillery detachment also. The cavalry horses have had to do the work of artillery horses, and the result is that they have not had the best work that could be had and should be had at the Academy. For years it has been urged upon Congress by the Boards of Visitors that this detachment be detailed from the Army to join with the cavalry and infantry detachments in instructions in the various arms of the service, and much better results will be had from it. The net increased expense to the Government amounts to but \$10. The committee were absolutely unanimous on this and believe that for the efficiency of the Academy the change should be made.

Mr. McRAE. Does this apply down to Miscellaneous, on page 6?

Mr. HULL. It applies to all the artillery detachments.

Mr. McRAE. And you say it will only cost how much in addition?

Mr. HULL. It will cost the Government \$10 more.

Mr. McRAE. Ten dollars only?

Mr. HULL. Yes. These men are now provided for on the Army appropriation bill, but when sent there they are detailed as privates, and in order to have efficiency they are made noncommissioned officers here. Heretofore every appropriation for the Academy has carried extra-duty pay to the cavalry detachment, amounting to \$560, while by this bill the difference in pay of these noncommissioned officers and of the privates is \$570; so that it makes a net increase of just \$10 to the Government by having that artillery detachment there.

Mr. McRAE. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of one enlisted man employed as watchman, at 35 cents per day, \$175.57.

Mr. McRAE. I want to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the fact that the arithmetic in that paragraph appears to be wrong.

Mr. HULL. What paragraph?

Mr. McRAE. Including lines 11, 12, and 13.

Mr. HULL. This man works Sundays and all.

Mr. McRAE. Three hundred and sixty-five days at 35 cents does not make \$175.57.

Mr. HULL. I have not carried out the figures, but this man works every day in the week. The figures are taken from the Book of Estimates.

Mr. McRAE. I make no question about the man; I only want to get the arithmetic right.

Mr. HULL. I will ask that that be passed over until the Clerk makes the computation.

Mr. McRAE. Well, the same thing occurs in the two paragraphs below, the second and third below. The calculation there is evidently wrong.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman wait until we can see what that figures up?

Mr. McRAE. If the gentleman does not make the correction, I move to strike out "one hundred and seventy-five" and insert "one hundred and twenty-seven dollars and seventy-five cents."

Mr. HULL. Thirty-five cents is the extra pay, and it is simply a question of arithmetic.

Mr. McRAE. Multiply it by 365, and you will find it makes \$127.75.

Mr. HULL. There is no objection to that amendment being made.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 12 and 13 strike out "seventy-five" and insert "twenty-seven;" in line 13 strike out "fifty-seven" and insert "seventy-five."

The amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of one enlisted man employed in the philosophical department observatory as a mechanic, at 50 cents per day, \$156.50.

Mr. McRAE. I move to strike that out and insert "one hundred and eighty-two fifty."

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out, in line 19, the word "fifty-six" and insert "eighty-two;" so as to read "one hundred and eighty-two dollars and fifty cents."

Mr. HULL. Just let us see what the estimates say about that. There may be some reason for that, as to the number of days' work.

Mr. McRAE. All right. I withdraw the amendment if the gentleman is satisfied.

Mr. BROMWELL. That amount is correct, because it makes three hundred and thirteen days, which is only fifty-two days off.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of one enlisted man employed in the philosophical department in care of apparatus, at 50 cents per day, \$156.50.

Mr. McRAE. I call attention to that, where the same error occurs.

Mr. HULL. They do not work on Sundays. It is the number of days. They only make it three hundred and thirteen days for that extra pay. They are only paid for the number of days actually employed.

Mr. McRAE. All right.

The Clerk read as follows:

For extra pay of 1 enlisted man as clerk in the department of practical military engineering and to the officer in charge of waterworks and works of construction at the Military Academy, at 50 cents per day, \$156.50: *Provided*, That the extra pay provided by the seventeen preceding paragraphs shall not be paid to any enlisted man who receives extra-duty pay under existing laws or Army regulations: *Provided further*, That the allowance of extra pay, as provided for in the acts of February 10, 1897 (29 Statutes at Large, page 518), March 5, 1898 (30 Statutes at Large, page 255), and February 27, 1899 (30 Statutes at Large, page 235), and of extra-duty pay to enlisted men of the Army stationed at the Military Academy, who have been placed on extra duty in obedience to the orders of the Superintendent, is hereby authorized and its payment directed, less the 20 per cent war increase already paid, the said payment being excepted from the operation of section 3691 of the Revised Statutes and of section 6 of the act approved April 26, 1898 (30 Statutes at Large, page 365).

Mr. McRAE. I make the point of order against the second proviso of that paragraph.

Mr. HULL. I hope the gentleman will simply withhold the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. I will withhold it for an explanation.

Mr. HULL. When we passed the bill providing for the Army at the time of the outbreak of war we made a provision of 20 per cent increase to all the enlisted force of the Army during the war period. We made no exception as to the Military Academy. But we have in the last two years appropriated for the Military Academy as extra-duty pay just the same as though that provision of the Army did not prevail. The war does not change conditions at West Point. In peace or war the work is the same.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there are a large number of these men who are skilled mechanics, and were enlisted under a practical contract by the Government that they should be detailed to do this work as carpenters and other skilled labor within their line, giving them extra-duty pay and thereby saving the employment of extra men, civilians, outside the Army. The War Department allowed these men 50 cents a day, or 35 cents a day, or whatever the law had provided for, but the Comptroller of the Treasury held it up on the ground that the law suspended that extra-duty pay, and that while the whole Army got 20 per cent extra duty, he has held no one soldier could have any extra pay for any additional work he might do. The Treasury decision was correct.

That was practically the law. The war made no difference with West Point. Congress should have excepted the Academy from this law. The same detachments were kept, the men were married and lived there from year to year, because we had provided them houses and furnished them, and had really contracted that in addition to their pay as soldiers they get this extra-duty pay, that would otherwise go to civilians for work to be done at much greater cost to the Government; they saved the Government money. It is a practical violation of a contract by the United States Government if we refuse to pay these men this extra-duty pay. We have appropriated for it in every one of the Military Academy bills for twenty years, under which they enlisted and under which they have performed the work.

But we have carried it so that while they have received this 20 per cent provided for the Army duty that must now be deducted from the amount appropriated by Congress on the Military Academy bill. It does not affect this bill at all, because that law has been changed so that the soldiers in the Army only get this additional pay when serving in the island possessions of the United States or in Alaska. They will get it in this bill. They will get extra pay on the last bill after the time the Government ceased to pay it to the Army at large. It has been appropriated; it has been allowed by the War Department; the money has been

earned by these men, private soldiers, and it ought to be paid by the Government of the United States.

I hope that my friend from Arkansas will not insist on the point of order. The committee was unanimously in favor of it. The members of the minority and the majority went over it quite fully before it was determined, and there was no difference of opinion. It was only an act of justice. It is suggested by my friend from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] that while they are only enlisted men they are enlisted for the specific purpose of doing this extra work, skilled men; and I do not believe my friend will raise the point of order. It is subject to it, and if the point is insisted on must go out.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I sought when the Army bill was pending to get a change to prevent just exactly what I predicted would occur if that bill was passed in the way in which it was presented.

Mr. HULL. That change, I will say to the gentleman, had nothing to do with this. This last proviso, I will say to my friend, only applies to the past. It does not apply to this bill at all. Two or three appropriation bills have been passed since the declaration of war with Spain. We have appropriated for it, but the men have not got it, because the Comptroller held them up on the ground that the 20 per cent was given when it was to go to the whole of the Army.

Mr. McRAE. These men have gotten the 20 per cent increase, as if they had been engaged in war, but they had not been so engaged, and yet we find they have been paid this 20 per cent and promised the extra pay besides. This, in my opinion, is all wrong, and will be an expensive precedent.

The result will be that in the next Congress you will find other enlisted men who have performed extra work coming in here and asking for extra-duty pay. How can we deny them if we grant this? The 20 per cent increase ought to be stopped at once. It ought never to have been paid to men at this Academy.

Mr. HULL. There is no class in the Army, except West Point, where we appropriate directly to them for a specific purpose, for so much a day, and it could not affect anybody but the Military Academy, and it does affect them, because these men have been enlisted with an agreement on this point.

Mr. McRAE. But if you make the Military Academy a precedent, you will find that every soldier who is similarly situated as to extra work will make that a basis for a claim, and I predict that if you pass this law you will have thousands of dollars to pay because of it in the future. These men have no better right to the money than enlisted men in any other part of the United States. I want them to have the extra pay for extra work, but I want the 20 per cent increase in time of peace stopped, and I do not think we ought to pay it to those who have taken the 20 per cent increase.

Mr. HULL. It is stopped; and not only that, but now that we have appropriated \$156 a year for the carpenter at the Observatory building—

Mr. McRAE. He is going to get that, and he wants this increase.

Mr. HULL. No; he wants what his contract provides for, less what he has been paid for extra duty. He wants what his contract calls for, what the Government promised him, what the officers at the Military Academy said he should have. He has gone on and done the work. It is not like any other men in the Army; it is special work that he was detached to do.

We have withdrawn him from the Army and assigned him to do this work. The work would have cost \$3 a day or more if you employed a civilian. These men have been kept there year after year because of the benefit to the Government, and it has been an absolute contract made by the Superintendent of the Academy and ratified by Congress by passing the bill which was held up on a technical construction of the Treasurer. It is not like any other part of the Army, and can not affect any other part of the Army.

Mr. McRAE. But others will come in under this as a precedent.

Mr. HULL. If they come in under this, and claim this as a precedent, if it is not a final and absolute contract made by an officer and appropriated for by Congress—as it is in this case—I will join with my friend from Arkansas to defeat such legislation.

Mr. McRAE. Well, I prefer to stop the basis of all such claims. I do not want to do any injustice to anybody, and if the gentleman wants to pass over this and return to it when the bill has been gone through with a point of order reserved, I am willing to do so.

Mr. HULL. I am willing, Mr. Chairman, that this should be passed over.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, this paragraph will be passed over.

Mr. HULL. This only applies to the second proviso.

Mr. McRAE. That is right, it is the second proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The second proviso will be passed over without objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

In all, for pay Military Academy Band, field musicians, general Army service, cavalry detachment, artillery detachment, enlisted men on detached service, and extra pay of enlisted men on special duty at the Military Academy, \$77,633.79.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, that total should be corrected to \$77,585.97, to correspond with the amendment that has been made in the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 23 and 24 strike out "six hundred and thirty-three and seventy-nine" and insert "five hundred and eighty-five and ninety-seven;" so that it will read: "seven-seven thousand five hundred and eighty-five dollars and ninety-seven cents."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

For pay of assistant plumber, \$720.

Mr. McRAE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee if this is not an increase in this item?

Mr. HULL. That is an increase of pay of \$10 a month, making \$120 a year.

Mr. McRAE. What is the necessity for that?

Mr. HULL. The necessity was that they keep this man there by the year. He is a faithful, efficient man, a good plumber, a civilian, and the evidence before the committee was that it cost at least \$10 a month more for him to live than it did a few years ago. There is no doubt but that the extra \$10 is subject to a point of order if the gentleman wants to make it.

Mr. McRAE. I do not want to be put in the position of making a point of order against this plumber, but I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this is an increase in the pay of a man who has been there for many years, doing the plumbing at this Academy for \$600. I think this enough for the work. The gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, can take the responsibility for the increase, but I protest against it.

Mr. HULL. That is right; it is as the gentleman says; and on page 139 of the estimate is the reason for giving it.

The Clerk, proceeding with the reading of the bill, read as follows:

Repairs and improvements, namely: Timber, planks, boards, joists, wall strips, laths, shingles, slate, tin, sheet lead, zinc, nails, screws, locks, hinges, glass, paints, turpentine, oils, varnish, brushes, stone, brick, flag, lime, cement, plaster, hair, sewer and drain pipe, blasting powder, fuse, iron, steel, tools, machinery, mantels, and other similar materials, renewing roofs, and for pay of overseer and master builder and citizen mechanics, and labor employed upon repairs and improvements that can not be done by enlisted men, \$25,000.

Mr. McRAE. I would like to ask the chairman of the committee why this increase of \$5,000?

Mr. HULL. On account of the increase in the cost of material. The \$20,000 was not enough, and there has been a deficiency.

Mr. McRAE. Was it estimated for by the Department?

Mr. HULL. Yes; and when we took out some items that they had in their estimate for pay of employees, they wanted us to make it \$3,000 more than it is. This is the smallest amount that the committee thought they could possibly get along with.

The Clerk read as follows:

For foils, masks, belts, fencing gloves, and fencing jackets, gaiters, and repairs, \$400.

Mr. McRAE. I should like to know the reason for the increase in this item for fencing gloves.

Mr. HULL. The increase is recommended by the superintendent of the Academy; and the statement of the Book of Estimates is that the stock of these articles has largely run out, that the number needing to be replaced is larger than usual, and that the appropriation named in the bill is as small a sum as this department of the Academy can get along with.

Mr. McRAE. Does the gentleman think that we really need more of such articles as fencing gloves and masks than we have had heretofore at the Academy?

Mr. HULL. Some years a larger quantity has to be purchased than in other years, on account of the condition of the stock on hand. Some of these articles, I understand, have been in use for a long time and are entirely worn out, so that a larger proportion than usual needs to be replaced. At least that is the information given to the committee. If the gentleman will look at the Book of Estimates he will find that it supplements and supports what the superintendent says. I read from the Book of Estimates:

NOTE.—This increase is required because much of the fencing material, which was purchased six years ago, has become unserviceable. The price of fencing goods, nearly all of which is made abroad, has risen, and the present fourth class (146 members) is largely in excess of the classes of previous years.—Lieut. Col. O. L. Hein, Commandant of Cadets.

Mr. McRAE. I only want to say that I am opposed to all such increases.

The Clerk read as follows:

For plumes for cadet officers and acting officers, \$75.

Mr. McRAE. On the plumes I think I ought to make a point of order.

Mr. HULL. I have no fear of a point of order being sustained on this paragraph, because, as I understand, it has been carried

on the appropriation bill ever since the Academy was established. Last year we happened to have on hand enough plumes, and there was no need to buy any more; and therefore no appropriation for this purpose was made. This is just as legitimate a matter to be procured and the appropriation for procuring is as well established as a part of this bill as the purchase of coal, gas ranges, or anything of that kind.

The Clerk read as follows:

Twenty reconnaissance sketching boards, at \$4.50 each, \$90.

Mr. McRAE. I should like to know why the number and price of these articles have been increased.

Mr. HULL. The sketching class is larger than it has been heretofore, and this number of sketching boards is required. The fourth class for this year—the third class for next—which will go out sketching is more than twice as large as it has been in the last twelve or fifteen years.

Mr. McRAE. But you have increased the price 50 per cent also.

Mr. HULL. We have increased the price, and the number is also largely increased.

Mr. McRAE. There is an increase of 50 per cent in the price.

Mr. HULL. I do not know as to that. Possibly the increase is 50 per cent.

Mr. McRAE. The bill shows it.

Mr. HULL. The price is what the Superintendent said it would be necessary to pay in order to get the class of boards required.

Mr. McRAE. I move to amend by striking out "\$4.50" and inserting "\$3," which is the price paid heretofore.

Mr. HULL. This amendment, by hanging up a very small appropriation, may result in destroying utterly the field work of the cadets for the next fiscal year. I hope the amendment will not be adopted.

Mr. McRAE. The Academy will pay for these articles whatever we appropriate. The people who furnish them will make the Academy pay the full price which the law allows. But if we limit the price to \$3, the articles will be furnished at that price as heretofore.

This bill is growing immensely—growing beyond what it ought to be. An increase of 50 per cent in a little item like this is absolutely unreasonable. There is no increase in the cost of making these articles; and to authorize the payment of an increased price is simply throwing money away.

Mr. HULL. I have given the committee all the information I have. Possibly, by an amendment, you may save twenty or thirty dollars on this item and do no harm; but it seems to me you are taking the chance of doing harm for a very small sum of money.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE].

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For manufacture or purchase of models of breech mechanisms of cannon, rapid-fire guns, small arms, and the various machines and tools used in their manufacture, for cadet instruction, \$1,500.

Mr. McRAE. I make a point of order on these words in the paragraph just read: "And the various machines and tools used in their manufacture." These words do not properly belong here. I think they are new in this bill, and ought not to be here.

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; they are not new. This bill has carried them right along. There has never been a time when we did not appropriate for what was needed in the way of models for the instruction of the classes. The language to which the gentleman objects is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. McRAE. It was not carried in the last bill, was it?

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; it is in the last bill.

Mr. McRAE. There is no law for purchasing "various machines and tools used in the manufacture" of cannon, etc.

Mr. HULL. A provision of this kind was in the last bill and has been in a great many bills. There is a small increase in this bill—an increase of \$500 dollars—because we are anxious that the classes at the Academy shall receive instruction in regard to the mechanism of some of our disappearing guns that will be made at the Watervliet Arsenal; we desire them to be taught the manner of constructing and managing these disappearing fortification guns. The tools referred to here are not for the manufacture of cannon, but for the manufacture of models. They are all made at the Academy.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas insist on the point of order?

Mr. McRAE. I do, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HULL. Well, I hope the Chair will look at the past appropriations covering this point before deciding the point of order. This proposition to which the gentleman from Arkansas refers has nothing whatever to do with the point of order decided by the Speaker heretofore.

Now, we do not wish to extend the scope of the bill a single iota. We are entirely willing that it shall be framed, formulated, and passed upon the same lines which have heretofore been adopted.

Mr. McRAE. I am entirely willing that the bill shall be framed upon the lines suggested by the gentleman from Iowa. But I do object to the introduction of other matter, which is not a part of the law, which can not properly be inserted in the bill.

I am willing that whatever is necessary to teach the young men at the Academy to use their guns and become expert marksmen should be provided, and if this provision is necessary I am willing to waive my objection to it. But this seems to me to be a provision which, in its broadest sense, might be used for authorizing the manufacture of guns or anything else there.

Mr. HULL (interrupting). This does not manufacture anything except models.

Mr. McRAE. There is no law authorizing the manufacture of models at the Academy that I know of, and there should be none. Our gun factories are the proper places for such work.

Mr. HULL. It does not change the ordinary provision of law with reference to this branch of the service. It has nothing to do with the question of manufacture. It is simply a provision which has been carried in all the appropriation bills. It does not provide for the general manufacture of arms or anything of that character, as the gentleman will see if he will examine.

Mr. BROMWELL. May I suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas that this is not for the manufacture of small arms, but for the preparation of models, as the law now provides?

Mr. HULL. And they have always had the plant and the machinery to make these models. I do not think there can be any question as to the propriety of this provision in the bill. I ask for a ruling on the question of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that this paragraph calling for the manufacture of models in the following words:

For manufacture or purchase of models of breech mechanisms of cannon, rapid-fire guns, small arms, and the various machines and tools used in their manufacture, for cadet instruction, \$1,500—

is strictly within the rule, and that the words to which attention has been called are therefore clearly within the rule. The Chair therefore overrules the point of order.

The Clerk will proceed with the reading of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

For contingent funds, to be expended under the direction of the academic board: For instruments, books, repairs to apparatus, and other incidental expenses not otherwise provided for, \$1,000;

Provided, That all technical and scientific supplies for the departments of instruction of the Military Academy shall be purchased by contract or otherwise, as the Secretary of War may deem best.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that proviso, and I should like to have some explanation as to why we should change the general policy of the Government in buying what is required at the Academy without advertisement.

Mr. HULL. It follows the same order that we have had heretofore. The prices of these technical books, and so forth, are fixed, and if advertising is required in all cases before buying, it simply adds that much to the cost. This simply relates to technical and scientific books and supplies. It is the same proviso that we have had right along, and I think it is a matter of economy to leave it in this way. I do not think it is subject to the point of order. Of course, it is subject to amendment, if the gentleman desires to amend it, but I think it would only increase the cost on these small items to require advertising in all cases. Boards of visitors, composed of both parties, in investigating the accounts of the Academy, have never raised any question of an abuse of this authority, which has been exercised heretofore by the Secretary of War.

Mr. McRAE. All through this bill, beginning here, and on nearly to the end, are provisions for purchasing different articles without advertising, in contravention of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. Specific sums are appropriated, and in many cases large increases, with the proviso allowing purchase of goods in open market or otherwise, and in many cases without providing for competition. If you make such appropriations as this you need not wonder if you find extravagance in the purchase of these articles.

With the recent exposures in Cuba, it seems to me that gentlemen on the other side ought to be willing to put all possible restrictions on every officer of this Government who handles public money. I shall content myself with calling attention to these provisions and doing what I can to have these supplies purchased as all other supplies of the Government are purchased and ought to be purchased, by advertisement. I believe this proviso is unnecessary and contrary to law. I can see no reason for making an exception to the rule which applies to all other people in the employ of the Government. It makes extravagance possible.

Mr. HULL. In answer to that I will only say that this is the same proviso we have had for years. If Congress were to require advertising to buy every little bill of \$75 or \$150, as the items range along through this bill, you would simply double the cost to the people. I believe the Secretary of War, whether he is Republican or Democrat, has enough honesty in him to protect the people in little purchases of this kind. To require the advertising of all these little purchases only diverts what you might save in one

line into the hands of another set of men and adds to the total cost.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

Mr. McRAE. I made a point of order against that proviso that it changes section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Mr. HULL. It has been in the bill for years.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Arkansas on the point of order.

Mr. McRAE. I will ask the Clerk to read this section, or I will read it myself:

SEC. 3709. All purchases and contracts for supplies or services, in any of the Departments of the Government, except for personal services, shall be made by advertising a sufficient time previously for proposals respecting the same, when the public exigencies do not require the immediate delivery of the articles or performance of the service. When immediate delivery or performance is required by the public exigency, the articles or service required may be procured by open purchase or contract, at the places and in the manner in which such articles are usually bought and sold, or such services engaged, between individuals.

The CHAIRMAN. What section is that?

Mr. McRAE. Section 3709.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa desire to be heard further?

Mr. HULL. I only desire to state that this proviso has been in the Military Academy appropriation bill for years. I could state several reasons for it which do not relate to the point of order, but which go to show why it should be left in the bill as a matter of good legislation. On the question of the point of order it seems to me that the practice of carrying it from year to year shows conclusively that it is not subject to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Arkansas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that this proviso is subject to the point of order, being contrary to the provisions of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For purchase of instruments for band, to be purchased in open market by order of the Superintendent, \$350.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, there is the same trouble again.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Arkansas raise the point of order?

Mr. McRAE. Yes.

Mr. HULL. Well, I simply want to say that if these points of order are sustained against this, you destroy all the legislation in this bill. If it is subject to a point of order, I think you had better strike the whole item out. If Congress has not the right to provide how a specific sum of money shall be spent, according to the universal results of past appropriations, you had better strike them out, because the advertising will cost more than the purchase; more than double the cost.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the gentleman thinks it will destroy the bill, if he desires it, I will withdraw the point of order against these items and content myself with opposing this method of purchase.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Maintaining and improving the grounds of the post cemetery, \$3,000.

Mr. McRAE. I would like to ask why this increase of \$1,000?

Mr. HULL. The cemetery grounds have been largely increased. The original proposition was to appropriate a thousand dollars for these grounds. The extra amount in this bill could have been deferred to the future very well; but I will say to the gentleman from Arkansas that one reason we give the two thousand increase this year that might possibly just as well have waited until it was more urgently needed was because General Viele, an old graduate of the Academy and one of the Board of Visitors in the past year, has taken a great interest in it. He is a prominent landscape gardener, and offered his services, and asked the privilege of laying out the grounds and having all the superintendence required free of expense to the Government if you would just give him the increase in the amount for the labor.

Mr. McRAE. This does not make any new place for a salaried officer?

Mr. HULL. Oh, no; it was placed in here a little in advance of the time possibly that it would be absolutely imperative, because this old graduate of West Point, an accomplished engineer and landscape gardener, in the employ of the city of New York at this time, asked it as a favor to him in his old age to allow him to take charge of this work without cost to the Government.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer the following additional paragraph at the end of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

That from and after the passage of this act all cadets heretofore admitted, or hereafter admitted, to the Military Academy at West Point shall have administered to them an oath, in due form of law, that they will not in any way, manner, or form engage in the practice of hazing or maltreating cadets. And any cadet violating said oath shall, upon trial and conviction, be dismissed from the Academy.

Mr. HULL. I raise the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. MAHON. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. HULL. I will withhold it, to allow the gentleman to discuss his amendment.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I reserve the point of order against that.

Mr. HULL. I was going to make the point of order, but I did not want to cut the gentleman off from making remarks upon his amendment.

Mr. MAHON. I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, that an effort has been made by the Superintendent of this school for some years to stop what is not only outrageous treatment of cadets but brutal and ungentlemanly. To my knowledge cadets have during the last year been treated in a way that has thrown them into spasms and for a time their lives have been despaired of. I believe that the time has come, when we put young men in this military institution to educate them at the expense of this Government, that they should be taught that this is not the place to practice ruffianism; that they should be gentlemen in every sense of the word and in every way from the day they enter until they leave this institution.

Now, I know the point of order will prevail against this amendment, but I hope the gentleman will not make it, but will let the matter go into conference, and then the conferees may be able to devise some legislation that will put an end to this vicious practice.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Do you think making them take an oath would have much effect?

Mr. MAHON. I believe every cadet taking an oath would feel in honor bound to keep it.

Mr. HULL. I will say to my friend that we had quite a full discussion with the Superintendent of the Academy on this point, and that he believes that hazing is absolutely broken up. He has called all these young men together in their classes and put them on their honor, and has told them that any violation of that honor would result in a punishment that might lead to expulsion. He has left it to each class to look after itself, and that, I think, is better than any legislation upon the subject. Let us await the result of the work of the present Superintendent.

Mr. MAHON. They take an oath to support the Constitution and laws of the United States, and yet we have men now going into the second year who make it their business to maltreat cadets going into the first year.

Mr. HULL. They take an oath now, as I understand it, that they will abide by the rules and regulations of the Military Academy.

Mr. MAHON. Well, make it specific.

Mr. HULL. It is specific now. It is the law now that hazing is unlawful. It is true that they ought to have been punished more than they have, but it is difficult to find them out. By putting the men on their honor and saying to them, "We now put this thing in your hands; as professors we have not been able to ferret the offenders out and punish the boys, because it was a disgrace for the boy to tell upon the fellows who did it." The way that the new superintendent is now going at it, he assures us, will make hazing a thing of the past, and that we shall not hear any more about injury to the cadet or this reprehensible conduct.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The better way is for the gentleman to put in his amendment that if it is not stopped the Superintendent shall be discharged. That is the way to get at it.

Mr. MAHON. As I understand it, some officers in the Regular Army think, and they have so said to me, that because they have gone through it others should go through it. They have got it into their heads that it makes a better man of a boy to abuse him. I would hesitate to send a boy of mine to that institution. I repeat that during the past year the treatment has been absolutely brutal and vicious. The boy of a prominent officer in the Regular Army was beaten by the young men in that institution so that he was thrown into spasms and lay so for two or three days.

Now, if this can not be stopped by the officers at the institution, it should be stopped by legislation. Compel the young men to take a solemn oath to perform their duty, and if they violate their oath in that respect, let it be followed by dismissal. Are we to send young men to this institution to make blackguards of them, to teach men to be brutal?

Let me say, Mr. Chairman, that when the next class goes in, next September, the class that will graduate that year will administer to them the same treatment that they had administered to them when they went in. My only object in offering this amendment is to call the attention of this House and this Congress and the country to the brutal treatment that is permitted there on the cadets of that institution. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia: I believe that if the superintendent and officers in charge would take this thing in hand they could stamp it out.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is so. The trouble is not with the boys, but with the officers in charge of the institution.

Mr. MAHON. I hoped that there would be no point of order

made against this amendment, but that it might go into conference and some legislation be devised whereby this thing could be put an end to.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I have listened with much interest to what the gentleman from Pennsylvania says, and I agree with him fully that this practice should be stamped out, but I believe it is wrong to start in with the idea that these boys have to take an oath that they will do everything that they are in duty bound to do. The authorities at the Academy have ample power to make them behave; and if they do not do it, let them be expelled. There is no occasion for making a man take an oath that he will behave himself like a gentleman. Hazing can be stamped out. Let the authorities of the Academy make it an expulsion offense, and it will stop at once.

Mr. MAHON. I do not care what the legislation is. The gentleman from New York knows, and I know, that it has been going on thirty or forty years, and every year it is becoming more vicious and more inhuman. I absolutely would not send a boy of mine to that institution to be treated as this class has been treated for the past year.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Mr. Chairman, I hope that this is not coming out of my time. [Laughter.] I want to say that I am somewhat familiar with this subject. This hazing practice breaks out periodically. It broke out in 1882, and it was very bad; but it did not require an oath to stop it. General Merritt was there as Superintendent, and he simply expelled one cadet, and it stopped at once. It can be stopped at any time. There are plenty of rules and regulations there.

Mr. MAHON. They are not enforced now.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. I do not believe we should pass a law compelling every boy that goes there to take an oath to do his duty. He takes an oath now to obey the regulations.

Mr. MAHON. Well, then, all my amendment does is to broaden it a little. The cadet to-day, perhaps, does not think that the oath he takes has any restraint upon him in this particular; but if you broaden it and make it specific, I think there could be no mistake about it.

Mr. CLAYTON of New York. Let them change the regulations and make it an expulsion offense. Colonel Mills, the present Superintendent, is a competent officer. He is handling the affairs of the Academy in a very satisfactory manner. His authority is ample. It is not good policy for Congress to undertake to prescribe the rules and regulations in detail. I do not in any way defend hazing, but, as a matter of fact, the extent of it at West Point has been much exaggerated. Military discipline is necessarily severe, and many new cadets who have never been away from their mothers before are inclined to complain. It is unnecessary to require a special oath to regulate the conduct of cadets toward each other.

Mr. HULL. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MAHON. I will withdraw my amendment, Mr. Chairman. I know it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, the Clerk has completed the reading of the bill, but we passed over a proviso that we were to return to. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] reserved a point of order against a proviso.

Mr. McRAE. Since reserving the point of order I have not had the time to examine the proviso, and I think it is a very dangerous precedent. I would like to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, if he can not offer an amendment which will repeal the 20 per cent increase?

Mr. HULL. This does not apply to any part of the Army that is in the United States proper.

Mr. McRAE. When was it changed?

Mr. HULL. In the Army appropriation bill of this year, both parties concurring in the provision.

Mr. McRAE. The provision in the bill as passed by the House, I think, applied to all soldiers.

Mr. HULL. In the Army appropriation bill of this year a provision covering that matter was adopted on motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. HAY].

Mr. McRAE. The gentleman from Virginia, I think, intended to accomplish that object, but did not. I tried to get the chairman of the committee to consent to going back in order to adopt a provision of that kind; but it was not agreed to.

Mr. HULL. By the bill as passed by the House the increase applied only to soldiers outside the United States proper.

Mr. McRAE. I have a distinct impression that under the bill as it left the House the 20 per cent increase applied to all soldiers.

Mr. HULL. No; only to those in Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, and Alaska.

Mr. McRAE. Well, I would like to see the law.

Mr. HULL. I assure my friend that such is the law. The increase does not apply to any part of the Army in the United States proper.

Mr. McRAE. Has the gentleman a copy of the law at hand?

Mr. HULL. I have not; but I have no doubt the gentleman

from Virginia [Mr. HAY] and other gentlemen on that side will confirm what I say.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Allow me to suggest to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] that the effect of the law is that this additional pay applies only in time of war. That is the old law.

Mr. McRAE. But this is new law, made for the Spanish war.

Mr. HULL. I will say to my friend that this clause beginning "Provided further," does not apply to the provisions of this bill at all; it applies only to legislation heretofore passed. It does not apply to the fiscal year for which we are now appropriating.

Mr. McRAE. I can understand what this applies to, and if passed will be used as a precedent for all enlisted men. I doubt the amendment of the gentleman from Virginia accomplished what he intended it should accomplish and what I desired it should accomplish. I asked the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the committee, to return to that paragraph in order that we might prevent the further payment of this 20 per cent in the United States; and he refused.

Mr. HULL. That provision of law applies only to the islands I have named and to Alaska. Was not the 10 per cent increase of officers the provision that the gentleman wanted to go back to? That would have been subject to a point of order.

Mr. McRAE. Was not the 10 per cent increase to officers and the 20 per cent increase to enlisted men both involved in the same paragraph?

Mr. HULL. The 20 per cent is continued to the private soldier only when troops are serving outside the United States proper, except Alaska. It does provide for the payment of 20 per cent extra to troops in Alaska. The gentleman from Virginia, in order to make the provision specific, offered an amendment naming the places where it applied—Cuba, Porto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippines, and Alaska.

Mr. McRAE. Has this bill, to which the gentleman refers, become a law?

Mr. HULL. It has not; but that part of the bill has been agreed to by both Houses. There was no amendment in the Senate to that part of the bill.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I have very decided convictions about this 20 per cent extra pay. I want to have the law amended, if it is not already, as the gentleman thinks it is. But I will not insist upon the point of order, but will take the sense of the committee upon the question. I will therefore withdraw the point of order, if it be understood that I can be recognized to make a motion to strike out this proviso.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. McRAE. With the understanding I have stated.

Mr. HULL. Does the gentleman move to strike out the proviso?

Mr. McRAE. Yes, sir; I make that motion.

Mr. HULL. I hope that will not be done.

Mr. PAYNE. Let the proviso be read.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the proviso.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided further, That the allowance of extra pay, as provided for in the acts of February 10, 1897 (29 Stat. L., page 518), March 5, 1898 (30 Stat. L., page 255), and February 27, 1899 (30 Stat. L., page 295), and of extra-duty pay to enlisted men of the Army stationed at the Military Academy, who have been placed on extra duty in obedience to the orders of the Superintendent, is hereby authorized and its payment directed, less the 20 per cent war increase already paid, the said payment being excepted from the operation of section 3691 of the Revised Statutes and of section 6 of the act approved April 26, 1898 (30 Stat. L., page 365).

The question being taken on agreeing to the amendment of Mr. McRAE,

The CHAIRMAN said: The yeas appear to have it.

Mr. McRAE. I call for a division.

The question being again taken, there were—yeas 65, noes 51.

Mr. HULL. I call for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and Mr. McRAE and Mr. HULL were appointed.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported—yeas 62, noes 60.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. I move that the committee now rise and report the bill as amended to the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and, the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. O'GRADY reported that the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, having had under consideration the Military Academy appropriation bill, had directed him to report the same back with certain amendments, and with the recommendation that as amended the bill pass.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any of the amendments? If not, the Chair will submit them in gross to the House.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

CALL OF COMMITTEES.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the committees.

The Clerk called the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. COX. I rise for the purpose of calling up a bill reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman the authority of that committee to call it up?

Mr. COX. No, sir; but I do not see the chairman of the committee here. The bill has been reported by the committee.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman must have the authority of the committee to call it up.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, let me distinctly understand this. This is the only bill that has come out of the Committee on Banking and Currency, with a favorable report, with but one dissenting voice, and it is now on the Calendar.

The SPEAKER. That is not the question before the House. The question is, Has the committee authorized the gentleman to call up the bill? His answer is that it has not.

Mr. COX. Pardon me one moment. If the chairman has declined to call up a bill which is reported by the committee, has no member of the committee a right to call it up?

The SPEAKER. That is a question of fact.

Mr. PAYNE. It can only come up by unanimous consent, anyway.

Mr. COX. Where is the chairman of the committee?

Mr. HILL. The bill the gentleman refers to is now being considered by the committee, has been considered for the past two weeks, and will be considered to-morrow morning. Nobody is authorized to call it up.

Mr. DRIGGS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I am going to tell the truth about it—

Mr. SHATTUC. Regular order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. Under the statement made by all of the gentlemen, there is nothing from that committee to be considered. The Clerk will call the next committee.

The Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures was called.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures be passed without prejudice for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio, chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, asks unanimous consent that that committee be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. I object.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I should like to call up the bill No. 1612.

The SPEAKER. By authority of the committee?

Mr. SOUTHARD. By authority of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The chairman of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, by direction of that committee, calls up a bill for consideration. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Ohio that this bill is upon the Union Calendar, and only bills on the House Calendar can be brought up on this call. The Clerk will call the next committee.

The Clerk called the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. CORLISS. I ask unanimous consent that that committee be passed without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that this committee be passed without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I should like to ask the gentleman what bill is it that the gentleman desires to have called up, in view of passing the committee without prejudice?

The SPEAKER. It is the call of the committee that the gentleman asks to have passed without prejudice.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I wish to ask the gentleman if it is in view of calling up the bill that we have had up heretofore in reference to the Chinese Commission?

Mr. CORLISS. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee is not upon the floor, and there are some bills—

The SPEAKER. The Chair can not recognize that argument. It is the duty of every gentleman to be in his place. The Clerk will call the next committee.

The Clerk called the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 11059 is reported by that committee, and I am authorized to call it up. It is the same bill which passed the Senate on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Has the gentleman authority from the committee to call it up?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes.

AMERICAN REGISTER FOR SHIPS STAR OF BENGAL AND STAR OF ITALY.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill referred to by the gentleman from Washington.

The bill (H. R. 11059) to provide an American register for the ships *Star of Bengal* and *Star of Italy* was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioner of Navigation is hereby authorized and directed to cause the foreign-built ships the *Star of Bengal* and the *Star of Italy* owned by citizens of the United States, to be registered as vessels of the United States.

The following amendment, recommended by the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, was read:

After the words "United States," in line 5, insert "or of Hawaii."

Mr. JONES of Washington. A bill identical with this passed the Senate on yesterday. I would like to know whether the bill has come over and is on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. It is not on the Speaker's table.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Then, Mr. Speaker, I will ask to let this bill go and call up the Senate bill, and ask unanimous consent for its consideration later. I think that will save time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the next committee.

The Committee on Foreign Affairs was called.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, by authority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I call up the bill (S. 2931) to incorporate the American National Red Cross, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts, by authority of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, calls up a bill which the Clerk will report.

The bill was read, as follows:

Whereas on the 22d of August, 1864, at Geneva, Switzerland, plenipotentiaries respectively representing Italy, Baden, Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Portugal, France, Prussia, Saxony, and Wurtemberg, and the Federal Council of Switzerland agreed upon ten articles of a treaty or convention for the purpose of mitigating the evils inseparable from war: of suppressing the needless severity and ameliorating the condition of soldiers wounded on the field of battle; and particularly providing, among other things, in effect, that persons employed in hospitals, and in affording relief to the sick and wounded, and supplies for this purpose, shall be deemed neutral and entitled to protection; and that a distinctive and uniform flag shall be adopted for hospitals and ambulances, and convoys of sick and wounded, and an arm badge for individuals neutralized; and

Whereas said treaty has been ratified by all of said nations, and by others subsequently, to the number of 43 or more, including the United States of America; and

Whereas a permanent organization is an agency needed in every nation to carry out the purposes of said treaty, and especially to secure supplies and to execute the humane objects contemplated by said treaty, with the power to adopt and use the distinctive flag and arm badge specified by said treaty in Article VII, on which shall be the sign of the red cross, for the purpose of co-operating with the "Comité International de Secours aux Militaires Blessés" (International Committee of Relief for the Wounded in War); and

Whereas, in accordance with the requirements and customs of said international body, such an association, adopting and using said insignia, was formed in the city of Washington, D. C., in July, 1881, known as "The American National Association of the Red Cross," and reincorporated April 17, 1893, under the laws of the District of Columbia; and

Whereas it is believed that the importance of the work demands a reincorporation by the Congress of the United States: Now, therefore,

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Clara Barton, George Kennan, Julian B. Hubbell, of the District of Columbia; Stephen E. Barton, of New York; William B. Day, of Ohio; Brainard H. Warner, Ellen Spencer Mussey, Alvey A. Adee, of the District of Columbia; Joseph Sheldon, of Connecticut; Charles F. Fairchild, William Letchworth, of New York City; Hilary A. Herliert, of Alabama; Joseph Gardner, Enola Lee Gardner, of Bedford, Ind.; John W. Noble, of St. Louis, Mo.; Richard Olney, of Boston, Mass.; Alexander W. Terrell, of Austin, Tex.; Leslie M. Shaw, Benjamin Tillinghast, of Iowa; Abraham C. Kaufman, of Charleston, S. C.; J. B. Vinet, of New Orleans, La.; George Gray, of Delaware; Redfield Proctor, of Vermont; George F. Hoar, of Massachusetts; Charles A. Russell, of Connecticut; Robert W. Miers, of Indiana, and their associates and successors, are hereby created a body corporate and politic in the District of Columbia.

SEC. 2. That the name of this corporation shall be "The American National Red Cross," and by that name it shall have perpetual succession, with the power to sue and be sued in courts of law and equity within the jurisdiction of the United States; to have and to hold such real and personal estate as shall be convenient and necessary to carry out the purposes of this corporation hereinafter set forth, such real estate to be limited to such quantity as may be necessary for official use or office buildings; to adopt a seal and the same to alter and destroy at pleasure; and to have the right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes hereinafter designated, as an emblem and badge, a Greek red cross on a white ground, as the same has been described in the treaty of Geneva, August 22, 1864, and adopted by the several nations acceding thereto; to ordain and establish by-laws and regulations not inconsistent with the laws of the United States of America or any State thereof, and generally to do all such acts and things as may be necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this act and promote the purposes of said organization; and the corporation hereby created is designated as the organization which is authorized to act in matters of relief under said treaty.

SEC. 3. That the purposes of this corporation are and shall be—

First. To furnish volunteer aid to the sick and wounded of armies in time of war, in accordance with the spirit and conditions of the conference of Geneva of October, 1863, and also of the treaty of the Red Cross, or the treaty of Geneva of August 22, 1864, to which the United States of America gave its adhesion on March 1, 1882.

Second. And for said purposes to perform all the duties devolved upon a national society by each nation which has acceded to said treaty.

Third. To succeed to all the rights which have been hitherto held and to all the duties which have heretofore been performed by the American National Red Cross as a corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the

United States relating to the District of Columbia, which organization is hereby dissolved.

Fourth. To act in matters of voluntary relief and in accordance with the military and naval authorities as a medium of communication between the people of the United States of America and their armies, and to act in such matters between similar national societies of other governments through the "Comité International de Secours" and the Government and the people and the armies of the United States of America.

Fifth. And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities.

Sixth. And to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same, and generally to promote measures of humanity and the welfare of mankind.

SEC. 4. That from and after the passage of this act it shall be unlawful for any person or association of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to wear or to display the sign of the Red Cross or any colorable imitation of said insignia, except in the service of the Government of the United States or by permission of the American National Red Cross, for the purpose of collecting, soliciting, or receiving money or material, or for any person or organization to use the said symbol or name of the Red Cross, in doing, or in attempting to do, work similar to the American National Red Cross without permission as aforesaid, and the person or association so using the said Red Cross, or any colorable imitation thereof, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor, and shall be liable to a fine of not less than \$50 nor more than \$500, or imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or both, for each and every offense. The fine so collected shall be paid to the American National Red Cross.

SEC. 5. That the said American National Red Cross shall report annually to the Secretary of State concerning its proceedings, and to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy when working with either or both of these Executive Departments of the Government.

SEC. 6. That Congress shall have the right to repeal, alter, or amend this act at any time.

The following amendments, recommended by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, were read:

On page 3, section 1, line 8, after the word "Indiana," insert: "George C. Boldt, William T. Wardell, of New York; Daniel Hastings, J. Wilkes O'Neill, of Pennsylvania; Thomas F. Walsh, of Colorado; John G. Sumner, of California; Charles C. Glover, Walter S. Woodward, Elizabeth Kibbey, Mabel T. Boardman, Walter Wyman, Sumner I. Kimball, of the District of Columbia; Edward Lowe, of Michigan."

On page 4, section 2, line 8, after the word "treaty," insert "In accordance with article 7 of the treaty, the delivery of the brassard allowed for individuals neutralized in time of war shall be left to military authority."

On page 4, section 3, line 22, insert after the word "rights" the words "and property."

On page 5, section 4, lines 20 and 21, strike out the words "colorable imitation of said insignia except in the service," and insert instead thereof the words "insignia colored in imitation thereof except by authority."

On page 6, section 4, line 8, after the word "Cross," insert the words "The appointment of the chief medical officer shall not be made without the approval in writing of the Secretary of War."

On page 6, strike out section 5 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 5. That the said American National Red Cross shall, on the 1st day of January of each year, make and publish in at least two of the daily papers of the city of Washington, D. C., a full, complete, and itemized report of all receipts and expenditures of whatever kind, and of its proceedings during the preceding year and shall also give such information concerning its transactions and affairs as the Secretary of State may from time to time require, and, in respect of all business and proceedings in which it may be concerned in connection with the War and Navy Departments of the Government, shall make reports to the Secretary of War and to the Secretary of the Navy, respectively."

Mr. McRAE. I will ask if that bill is on the House Calendar?

The SPEAKER. The Chair is advised that it is.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I make the point of order that this bill ought to be on the Union Calendar. I have not been able to get a copy of the bill, but, as I understand it, it provides for prosecutions in the Federal courts, and therefore it must indirectly involve an expense against the Government. If so, it should go to the Union Calendar, and could not be called up in this hour.

The SPEAKER. Is that the only point the gentleman has to submit—the fact that prosecutions are to be conducted in the Federal courts?

Mr. RICHARDSON. I understood the gentleman to say he had authority from the committee to call it up in this hour?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I did say so.

Mr. COX. Well, then, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. RICHARDSON. I am in sympathy with the main object of the bill, but have not been able to examine it at all since it was read this morning; and a bill of this importance, it seems to me, ought to be very carefully considered. I could not catch all the bill, but do I understand this bill limits this incorporated company to the District of Columbia?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. It is incorporated in the District of Columbia, but I will be frank to state to the gentleman that it is to be general in its operation throughout the United States.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Does the gentleman think we can incorporate a company for operation in the States?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I think so. My position is this, Mr. Speaker, unless the gentleman desires to insist upon the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair sees nothing in the bill that puts any burden upon the Government at all. It must specifically appear in the bill. The Chair overrules the point of order, and thinks the bill is upon the proper Calendar.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to move to strike out the enacting clause.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield for that purpose?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I do not.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BARTLETT. Section 4, as I caught the reading from the Clerk's desk, provides for penalties, making it a crime or misdemeanor to do certain acts described. Now, that section provides a penalty to be recovered and paid to the society. There is no section in the bill, as I gathered from the further reading of it, that provided where those suits shall be brought and the courts which shall have jurisdiction of them. None whatever. It does not say whether they shall be tried in the circuit or district courts of the United States, or what court shall have jurisdiction to enforce the penalty for violation of this section. Now, does the gentleman think that is a good section—to prescribe penalties and not to prescribe where they shall be imposed?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If that is too vague to be effective, I suppose it would please the gentleman, because it would be inoperative.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman who opposed this bill this morning is not present. I certainly would not have wished to bring it up in his absence; but I did not know there would be a call of committees until five minutes ago. Now, the objection which he made to the bill is the constitutional objection that the corporation operates throughout the United States. I think that is the true intent of the bill; but I think everyone will admit that this Red Cross, as we all know its operations, is a peculiar institution which we all would favor, so far as we could, and a treaty of the United States with other nations especially recognizes such work. In one article of the treaty there is this language:

The hospital ships which are equipped at the expense of the aid societies recognized by the governments signing this convention.

Thus there is a clause in the treaty which recognizes the appointment by the different nations of aid societies to carry on the purposes of the treaty. Consequently it seems to me there is a recognition that this is not a local or even a national society, but it is an international society, and in incorporating it we are carrying out the purpose of a treaty of the United States. Now, that seems to me—

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. COX. I want to ask you what authority you have to call up this bill?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I could not hear the gentleman's question.

Mr. COX. Did your committee authorize you to call up this bill?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. It did, as I stated before.

Mr. COX. Unanimously?

The SPEAKER. That was a preliminary statement made by the gentleman, or he would not have been recognized to call the bill up.

Mr. COX. I did not hear it.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman permit me to make an inquiry?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I find in reading the third section that a corporation already exists for the purpose of carrying into effect certain charitable purposes and objects. Why not perpetuate that corporation? Why not let the corporation that in the past has been performing these charitable works continue the performance of the same instead of abrogating its charter?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will read section 4—and I call attention to it because it is the section which I suppose would meet with opposition—he will find it provides that persons who shall use the insignia of this incorporation for the purpose of raising money or carrying out the purposes of the association unless authorized by the Government or the corporation shall be liable to a penalty. Now, that is not in the District charter. It could not, of course, be in the District charter. It is a charter under the general law, and it is to provide and effectuate that purpose that this bill comes here.

I think that is a proposition which will commend itself to every member of this House. In the past at times this Red Cross has been used by fraudulent persons—persons who wished to raise money under it, and not to apply it to the purposes for which the Red Cross money ought to be applied. They have gone around and assumed to collect money under the Red Cross badge and spend it as they pleased. This bill is drawn in such a way as to put a stop to anything of that kind.

Mr. KING. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Is not the same criticism which the gentleman makes against the present system a legitimate criticism against every charitable society that exists? In other words, do not some designing people go and trade on the credulity and charity of people, and thereby bring into contempt certain enterprises which already exist?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think they do.

Mr. KING. Is that a sufficient reason, now, why you should come into this Congress and invoke Federal interposition to give you a Federal charter to go throughout the world in charitable undertakings?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. That is precisely what I think is proper. The object of this incorporation is because the Red Cross has won by the efficient service it has rendered in the past a reputation which evil and designing persons can use, and which I think this Congress would be glad to protect. The same is not true of any other charitable society or badge that I know of. This is an international society, and it affects our relations with other nations. We can not succeed in protecting every society from fraud and imposition, but here is a great international society which has accomplished beneficent results which we can protect and I think we ought to protect.

Mr. RICHARDSON. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. RICHARDSON. I notice on page 6, at the close of section 4, this provision:

The appointment of the chief medical officer shall not be made without the approval in writing of the Secretary of War.

Now, who appoints this chief medical officer? There is no provision in the bill for his appointment, and I would like to ask if he is to be appointed by the Secretary of War or any governmental authority?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I suppose he would be appointed just as any officer of any corporation is appointed, under the by-laws of the directors.

Mr. RICHARDSON. This provision is for the appointment of the officer by the name of chief medical officer, and there is no provision in the bill for a chief medical officer. I was asking why you had that provision there; why you provide that he shall be appointed by and with the approval of the Secretary of War?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The reason was this: Of course in a time of war this association must act in cooperation with the War Department, and it was deemed very important that the chief medical officer, who, of course, would be the superintendent of the work of the Red Cross in hospitals and on the battlefield, should be some one who would act in harmony and have the confidence of the War Department, and therefore it was thought wise that he should be appointed with the consent of the Secretary of War, in order that there might be harmony and cooperation between the society and the War Department.

Mr. RICHARDSON. There was no intention to provide that the officer should be appointed by the Government or any officer of the Government?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Not at all. I would like to say one word more in regard to this. All the prominent nations of the world have signed a treaty, and every nation has an act similar to this, except that they are much more stringent, protecting the society.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri rose.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I would like to ask why are not some of us entitled to an hour in our own right as members of the committee to oppose this bill?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman wish for an hour?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; but I want a piece of an hour. [Laughter.]

Mr. KING. If the gentleman from Missouri does not want it, I would like time to oppose the bill.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. How much time does the gentleman from Missouri want?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Well, I want to know if I can be recognized for an hour in my own right.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do. I believe the gentleman wants to make a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Is not some one on the minority of the committee entitled to an hour?

The SPEAKER. That is within the control of the House, if the House does not pass the bill before the hour expires.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want the gentleman from Massachusetts to ask for the previous question until we can have time to oppose the bill on this side.

The SPEAKER. That is entirely within the control of the House.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want the floor in my own right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri can not have the floor as long as the gentleman from Massachusetts controls his hour.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. If the gentleman desires some

time, I will yield to him whatever may be reasonable. How much time would he like?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Some gentlemen over here want to speak about this bill, and I have two or three amendments that I want to offer to it.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I think that probably I might yield to those gentlemen such time as they desire.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want the time in that way, if I can get it the other way. [Laughter.]

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not yield the floor for "the other way" if I can avoid it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I wanted to ask the Speaker was this: In the discussion of the bill is not the minority entitled to an hour in its own right?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has answered the gentleman's question. That is a matter entirely within the control of the House. The gentleman from Massachusetts who called up the bill has been recognized and controls an hour. Long before that hour expires the House may pass the bill. The previous question may be ordered; or the House may decline to order the previous question; and more than an hour may run. If so, then some one in opposition to the bill would certainly be entitled to recognition.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Then I will take half a minute now to make one statement.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If this bill should pass at all, it ought to be amended in several respects; and we want a chance to offer such amendments as we deem proper.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I desire to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLETT] a question. I notice that clauses 5 and 6 of section 3 give this society general charitable powers throughout the United States; and this is done in such a way as would prevent all other societies from using the red cross in that kind of charitable work. Now, will not the bill, unless amended, legislate out of existence what is known as the Order of the Red Cross in Masonry—an institution that has existed for years and years and that has some charitable features?

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Is there such an order having this peculiar badge?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. There is.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I was not aware of it.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I refer particularly to the Order of the Red Cross in Masonry, a very old organization, formed largely for charitable purposes; and it is now engaged in its own way in doing acts of charity all over the country. This bill, I apprehend, will, unless amended, legislate out of existence that old institution.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. This is the first time, Mr. Speaker, I have known there was such an order. No one in the committee suggested the fact. If they have this particular badge, that fact, I should think, would be the only thing which would cause any conflict.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. They have the badge of the red cross.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. The Greek cross on a white ground?

Mr. BROMWELL. It is a Greek cross on a white ground. The organization referred to is a branch of the Templar organization; the higher branch of Masonry.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Of course, gentlemen who may read the bill will adopt their own interpretation of its effect. I know nothing about the existence of such an organization. Of course there was no purpose to interfere with or destroy it by anything in this bill.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I think that will be the effect of the bill unless amended.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman suggest an amendment?

Mr. CRUMPACKER. I would suggest that the clauses to which I have referred be stricken out. In the first place, it strikes me that it would not be very good policy to give to any association the exclusive right to the use of the cross as an emblem of the association. I suggest that clauses 5 and 6 be stricken out. That would obviate the objection I made respecting a conflict with the order of Masonry.

Mr. GILLETT of Massachusetts. I do not think the gentleman wishes to strike out clause 5, which seems to be essential in order to accomplish one of the purposes which our Red Cross organization has most effectively championed—the giving of relief in the case of different floods that we have had—for instance, the Mississippi flood and the Johnstown flood. Clause 5 does not apply to any such organization as the gentleman speaks of. I should think that if the last part of clause 6 were stricken out it would accomplish the gentleman's purpose.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. But clause 5 would prevent the existing order of the Red Cross, as a Masonic organization, from engaging in the relief of suffering humanity under the conditions mentioned in that clause, if it saw fit to do so. Clauses 5 and 6 of

section 3 ought to be struck out, because the organization to which I have referred as bearing the name of the Red Cross does a great deal of local charity.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. In reference to the suggestion of the gentleman to strike out this last clause by way of an amendment to the bill, I will state that I see no special objection to it. It does not, in my judgment, change the effect of the bill in any manner.

Mr. BROMWELL. If my friend from Massachusetts will allow me?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. BROMWELL. I was going to say further that there should be an amendment to section 4 of the bill, and I was going to ask the gentleman to accept an amendment inserting the following words or their equivalents:

Except where the same is now used by any charitable institution.

This, it seems to me, would obviate the objection of gentlemen who have found reasons for objection to the bill.

Mr. MAHON. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Ohio that the words in the bill as they appear in section 2, "the American Red Cross National Association" make it distinctively a branch of the Red Cross Association. There can be no confusion of terms there if we adopt that provision. We simply use the abbreviation "A. N. R. C." Association.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, and will yield to him to offer his amendment.

Mr. BROMWELL. Mr. Speaker, I have glanced hastily over the provisions of this bill, and believe that the amendment I present, and which the gentleman in charge of the bill will accept, will obviate certain objections which have been urged against it—especially the objection of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his amendment.

Mr. BROMWELL. I propose to insert the words "except where the same is now used by any charitable institution."

As I understand it, there is but one association which has of right as its insignia the Greek cross, and who uses it as a distinctive badge, and that is what is known as the Red Cross Association.

If the amendment I have suggested is adopted, I think it will obviate any conflict and will simplify the question which is presented for our consideration, without in any way interfering with the rights of the organization.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. Will the gentleman from Ohio give me his attention for a moment?

Mr. BROMWELL. Certainly.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. The gentleman proposes to amend by inserting the words "except where the same is used by any charitable institution."

Now, I ask him what does the word "where" in that connection mean, and to what does it apply?

Mr. BROMWELL. I am seeking to amend the paragraph to which objection has been made. I refer to section 4 of the bill.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. I understand that; but I call the attention of the gentleman to this particular word, used in that connection, and ask him what the meaning would be.

Mr. BROMWELL. If the gentleman will allow me, this section provides that it shall be unlawful for any person or association of persons within the jurisdiction of the United States to wear or display the sign of the red cross, and so on, and my amendment provides, in the same connection, to insert the words "except where the same is used by any secret charitable association." It will be seen that this covers the cases of many of the societies of the United States and of all of those who use this particular designation or symbol.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. "Except where." To what does the word "where" apply?

Mr. BROMWELL. Except in the cases where it is now used by this order. If the gentleman wants to make it more definite he can say "except in cases where."

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. The word "where" will not do. Secondly, I want to suggest that even if you insert that amendment, if an individual is found wearing the red cross, he is subject to prosecution under this bill, and on the trial must show that it is a secret order, that it is a charitable order, and that he was entitled to wear this badge where he was then found wearing it at the time of the passage of this bill.

Mr. BROMWELL. That is very simple. He can prove that it is a secret order without any trouble. Everyone understands that Masonry is a secret order. He can prove that it is a charitable order. Everyone understands that Masonry is a charitable order. It is now in existence, and has been for many years, and that is very easily proven, so that the objection of the gentleman does not seem to be very serious.

Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey. What everyone understands

and what you can prove in a court of justice are very different things.

Mr. BROMWELL. The facts that I have referred to can be proven by thousands of witnesses in this country. There are a hundred men on the floor of this House who can testify to them.

Mr. McCALL. Why should it be limited to a secret organization? Suppose it appears that another organization, before the passage of this act, has adopted this as an insignia. Why should not that organization have the same right to wear it that a secret organization has?

Mr. BROMWELL. I will grant that, but, as the gentleman from Massachusetts says, the only organization that any member on this floor has any knowledge of which uses this as a symbol is that one organization.

Mr. McCALL. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] happened to know of that. Now, we may be ignorant of some other organization that also has it. The gentleman must remember that the cross is a very old emblem. It has been in use in Christian countries for two thousand years, and I do not see why we should in this act give any special right to a secret organization that we should not give to any other organization. It seems to me the omission of the word "secret" would do no harm.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. But the purpose of this amendment is to except this one organization. Suppose there are some petty local organizations which use the red cross. We really want those to change their emblem or join this corporation. We think that the Red Cross Society is important enough to swallow them up. So I think the limited amendment is proper. If the gentleman does not wish to use the language which will specifically mention this one organization, then it should be described, and not apply to anything else.

Mr. CORLISS. Will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Certainly.

Mr. CORLISS. Why do you desire by this bill to create a monopoly in a charitable organization? This is a charitable organization, as I understand it, and you have here established a badge to indicate its purpose, and you undertake now to say that no one, unless authorized by this organization, shall collect money for charitable purposes by means of that sign. Why give them a monopoly of the distribution of charity in our country?

Mr. KING. The object of this bill is to create a charitable trust.

Mr. CORLISS. I have no objection to the organization. Its purpose is wise and benevolent, but I submit that it should not be given a monopoly, or any chance to use it in a manner that gives it exclusive control.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. It has been discovered by experience that in times of calamity and war many designing persons take advantage of the fact that the red cross is known as a badge of honor, so that persons seeing it will contribute, and use that badge to collect money, which they pocket. Now, there is not any great danger, I fancy, of a trust in charity. There is no probability that any deserving people who want to be recognized to collect money for charitable purposes will be prevented from doing it. Nobody wants to object to that. The Red Cross organization has been built up largely by the heroic work of Clara Barton, and all that this bill seeks is to provide that the badge of that order and the name of that order shall not be prostituted by designing persons for improper purposes.

Mr. CORLISS. I have no objection to that, and I have no objection to that organization having a trade-mark which shall be protected by special act of Congress; but I submit that you should not prohibit by an act of Congress the use of a badge that undoubtedly has been in use for hundreds of years before this organization was started. You undertake to legislate here so as to catch evil persons who are disposed to use this badge improperly. Now, I think cases of that kind are very rare.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Unfortunately, experience has shown that they are not rare.

Mr. CORLISS. Well, I do not think it is necessary to give a company this absolute power that is given here.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I can not conceive of any possible harm that can come of it. It does give them the power to use this badge, which they have won on their merit, for the purposes of its operation; and if anyone wants to be charitable in any other way, they can.

Mr. BROMWELL. The amendment I have suggested would be fair, after the word "therefore," in line 15, insert the words "except as above."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Are you through?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman desire to say anything?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want an hour.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If no one else wants to be heard, I shall ask for the previous question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to be recognized in my own right.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. There was no minority report, and the gentleman is not entitled as representing the minority.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What is the reason I am not entitled to represent the minority in opposition to the report? You do not have to make a minority report.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman wish time?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want time, and I want it in my own right, so that I can give it to these other gentlemen who want to discuss this bill.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If the gentleman wants to discuss it now, I will yield to him.

Mr. BARTLETT. Will you yield to me for an amendment?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will state what his amendment is, I will inform him.

Mr. BARTLETT. I want to strike out section 4.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I shall not yield for that.

Mr. BROMWELL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BROMWELL. It will be necessary, in order to get action upon the amendment suggested, that the House shall act upon that amendment, and the acceptance of it by the gentleman in charge of the bill is not sufficient.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman from Massachusetts yields for an amendment to any other member of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts loses the floor.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If nobody wishes further time—

Mr. BELLAMY. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Committee on Foreign Affairs considered the constitutionality of this act?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I can not answer what was in the minds of gentlemen. I presume they did.

Mr. BELLAMY. Did they really consider that question apart from the bill itself?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I can only answer for myself. I considered it.

Mr. BELLAMY. And the committee are of the opinion that the act is constitutional?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I can say that the committee unanimously authorized this report.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. If there is no other way of getting time except by accepting it from the gentleman from Massachusetts, I will take it.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not know.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to call attention to one or two features of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for five minutes in the time of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I want to state in the beginning that unless the gentleman from Massachusetts is reasonable about this bill, we will kill it, because there is not a quorum here, and we will have our rights. But what I want to call the attention of the House to is part of section 4. Now, the minimum punishment under section 4 for any violation of this act is \$50. I undertake to say, as a man having had a good deal of experience in criminal-law practice, that that fine is out of all proportion to the offense defined in the act itself. It is a greater minimum punishment than for petty larceny, for assault and battery, disturbance of the peace, using violent, tumultuous, and profane language, and nine-tenths of the misdemeanors that are carried on the statute books of any State in the Union. In fact, I doubt very seriously if there is a single, solitary misdemeanor defined by the statutes of any State in the Union that carries as heavy a minimum punishment as this.

Mr. HOPKINS. What is the maximum?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Five hundred dollars and imprisonment for a term not exceeding six months, or both.

Mr. KING. And the fine goes to the association.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And the fine goes to the association. Now, there is another thing about the bill. You can read it from "eend to eend," like old Harper, of Kentucky, used to run his horses, and you can not find what court of the United States has jurisdiction. You do not know whether it is the circuit court or the district court of the United States, or the circuit court of the State or the criminal court of the State, or the police court, and with that uncertainty hanging about it you would simply breed a conflict of authority.

Mr. HOPKINS. I should like to ask the gentleman from Missouri a question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Very well.

Mr. HOPKINS. From the gentleman's statement as to the collection of these fees and turning them over to the society, it is an innovation in criminal practice. What is the gentleman's judgment as to that being used as a means of oppression against people in many instances?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. My judgment and experience and observation is that it is extremely hazardous and dangerous to make anybody the beneficiary of fines in criminal cases, except the properly constituted authorities, and every man in this House who has ever been a prosecuting attorney—and most of us have [laughter]—knows that the most dangerous man that pokes his head into a court room is the informer.

And while you have to use his evidence sometimes, as a dernier resort, we generally have more sympathy for the man we are prosecuting than for the witness whose evidence we are using to convict him. My opinion is that the general purposes of this bill are all right, but surely that feature of it must appeal as unfair, not to say outrageous, to every man in this House. I think the bill really ought to be recommitted, with instructions to strike out the fourth section, or remodel it entirely.

Mr. SULZER. Will the gentleman yield a moment to me?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. SULZER. Is it not a fact that certain societies and manufacturers in this country have been using the Red Cross as a trade-mark for many years?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes; but I will say—

Mr. SULZER. And this would deprive them of the right to use that trade-mark?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. No; I do not think that is true. I think the gentlemen of the committee that had the bill in charge did their very best, and used a good deal of labor and intelligence in trying to frame that feature of the bill so that it would not interfere with any legitimate trade transaction, or with these secret societies. I do not think it is amenable to that objection.

Mr. SULZER. Well, I hope not. It ought not to be. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill if it is not a fact that a well-known manufacturing concern in New York City, Messrs. Seabury & Johnson, I believe, have used the trade-mark of the Red Cross in their business for a great many years, and under the fourth section of this bill, as it reads, would not this bill deprive them of their trade-mark?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. It would not affect them at all, as I read it. If the gentleman reads it carefully, he will see that it does not.

Mr. SULZER. If it would not affect them or others who have been using this insignia as a trade-mark in their business, what objection can you have to striking it out?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. The gentleman evidently does not appreciate the purpose of the section. It is not to protect the use of it in any business. It is to prevent the use of it, as the language says, for the purpose of collecting or soliciting money or material in aid or attempting to do work similar to the National Red Cross. That is the only purpose of it, and I will admit that I suppose the main purpose of procuring this charter is to get this protection rather than to have an incorporation under the general law.

Mr. SULZER. I want to say to my friend that I am in sympathy with the purpose of this bill, and I think the Red Cross Society should be protected, but at the same time I am opposed to depriving anybody of property rights in this way. It seems to me that the bill in this connection is objectionable.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. This does not affect the firm or trade-mark the gentleman speaks of.

Mr. SULZER. I remember now a short time ago I received a letter from the manufacturing concern of Messrs. Seabury & Johnson, in New York City, protesting against the passage of this bill for the very reason that it would deprive them of the use of their trade-mark, which they had registered with the Government and had used for a good many years. Now, will the gentleman consent to add a line that nothing herein contained shall be construed to deprive any person or persons, company or companies, society or corporation, from the use of the insignia as a trade-mark which has been used prior to the passage of the act.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will point out any clause in the bill which does affect them, I will consent to remedy it.

Mr. SULZER. I would say that I am not clear that it does affect their trade-mark, but it may be susceptible of that construction and we can not tell what construction the courts will put on the language. If you do not intend to deprive these people of the use of the insignia as used in their business, why not put it in the bill so that there can be no question about it?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Because I see no necessity for it. Nobody can point out a clause in the bill that is susceptible of any such construction.

Mr. SULZER. Well, I believe that it is capable of that construction. It might be a narrow view of it, but at the same time to be sure, you should not object to an amendment in the bill providing against it.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I have no objection except that it is entirely unnecessary. I will now yield—

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker, who has control of the time in opposition to the bill? I believe I have the floor.

The SPEAKER. No; the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] is speaking in the time yielded by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GILLET]. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY] to offer a resolution?

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I will.

ACCEPTANCE OF STATUE OF GENERAL GRANT.

Mr. McCLEARY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on the Library, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY], by direction of the Committee on the Library, asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved. That during the exercises on the 19th instant, incident to the reception and acceptance of the statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, the committee of the Grand Army of the Republic on the Grant Memorial, the present commander in chief of the Grand Army of the Republic, the senior vice-commander in chief, the junior vice-commander in chief, the surgeon-general, the chaplain in chief, the adjutant-general, the quartermaster-general, the inspector-general, the judge-advocate-general, and the senior aid-de-camp and chief of staff of the Grand Army of the Republic be admitted to the floor of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this resolution?

Mr. COX. I want to inquire from what committee this resolution comes?

The SPEAKER. From the Committee on the Library.

Mr. COX. Were they instructed to report it?

The SPEAKER. This is a request for unanimous consent, the gentleman from Massachusetts having yielded to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCLEARY].

Mr. COX. Yes; I tried to get unanimous consent a while ago. But what I want to know—

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that this resolution is not called up under the call of committees at all, but the request is for unanimous consent.

Mr. COX. But what I want to know is how it is when we are running these requests for unanimous consent a committee can get in its work.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [A pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. McCLEARY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was adopted was laid on the table.

CODE FOR ALASKA.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I yield for a moment to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WARNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WARNER] to submit a request for unanimous consent, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WARNER asks unanimous consent that the bill S. 3419, "An act making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," shall be taken up for consideration immediately after the reading of the Journal on Wednesday, May 16, 1900, and be the continuing order, subject to conference reports, until finally disposed of: *Provided, however,* That it shall not operate to change the rules as to the assignments of Fridays.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to this request of the gentleman from Illinois? The Chair hears none, and the order is accordingly made.

AMERICAN NATIONAL RED CROSS.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Massachusetts would put his bill into such a position that amendments could be offered, I would gladly support it. I think that the protection which he asks for this society is right. But on page 4 of the bill there is a provision that this association shall "have the right to have and to use, in carrying out its purposes hereinafter designated, as an emblem and badge, a Greek red cross on a white ground," etc. Now, why should not the red cross when thus used as an emblem or badge be distinguished in some way from the red cross as used by other associations? I would suggest that the cross used by this society might have inscribed upon it the initials "A. N. R. C." This would give the badge of this society a dis-

tinguishing mark, and other organizations could still use the cross in any way they saw proper so long as these distinguishing letters were omitted.

I am opposed to the fifth and sixth clauses of section 3, which provide as follows:

Fifth. And to continue and carry on a system of national and international relief in time of peace and apply the same in mitigating the sufferings caused by pestilence, famine, fire, floods, and other great national calamities.

Sixth. And to devise and carry on measures for preventing the same, and generally to promote measures of humanity and the welfare of mankind.

Under these provisions it might be claimed that this organization had the right to interfere with the quarantine regulations of the States or of the health boards of the cities. This part of the bill would seem to confer on this organization general quarantine power, which is not necessary for the work of the society and which ought not to be authorized by Congress. Without such provisions the bill would be just as effectual for the purposes contemplated by this organization.

I am opposed also to the provision of section 5, that this association shall make report to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and to the provision that the chief medical officer shall not be appointed without the approval in writing of the Secretary of War.

Mr. HOPKINS. Is it not the opinion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this bill is so defective that it is a waste of time to continue its consideration at present?

Mr. MAHON. It is a good bill, but it ought to be amended.

Mr. HOPKINS. This seems to be the nucleus of a good bill, and can undoubtedly be perfected. I would suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that for the present it be withdrawn, and after the expression of sentiment which the House has given upon it it can hereafter be perfected.

Mr. MAHON. My contention is that this supervision should be taken entirely away from the Government. If this bill is passed in its present form, it will lead to trouble hereafter.

Mr. KING. Unquestionably. The Red Cross institution will come in hereafter and say that it possesses all of the requisites of a Government institution by reason of this legislation, and will ask bounties and privileges and payments and all that sort of thing for its support.

Mr. MAHON. I want to have the association entirely independent and separate from any governmental organization.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in response to the remarks of the gentlemen who have been criticising the bill, I only wish to say that the reports which are to be made by this association are to be made in compliance with law; and it is only necessary to add that the bill provides in specific terms how they shall be made and where they shall be made.

Mr. MAHON. Well, let us get the matter out of the line in which it seems to have been drafted and give it altogether a new start. It seems to me that the provisions to which the gentleman from Massachusetts refers might be construed in various ways and give us trouble hereafter. I object to it.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have promised to yield a few minutes of time to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], and I now yield to him such time as he may desire in this connection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House to the sections of the bill which seem to me might be and would necessarily be construed as interfering with both the State or national quarantine regulations. By the bill this corporation in its fifth subdivision of enumerated powers is given authority to render relief in cases of pestilence, etc., and in its sixth subdivision of enumerated powers is further authorized to adopt means to prevent the same, etc. Now, while the bill restricts the by-laws and regulations of the corporation so as not to come in conflict with the laws of the United States and the several States, its charter powers are nevertheless of equal force and dignity with national and State laws on the same subject, and it is here where the conflict would likely arise. There should be no room for misconstruction, and the bill should be so guarded as to in no wise interfere with either national or State quarantine laws. As the bill now stands, this corporation, as regards its general powers, would stand in force and dignity with national and State quarantine boards on the same plane.

If the law is passed as this bill proposes, I do not see how it is possible that it will not come in conflict not only with national quarantine laws, but with State laws controlling quarantine operations, and for that reason I am of the opinion that unless this section of the bill be amended in some shape it ought not to pass this House. While I do not object to the general charity features of the bill, there is no question that a conflict may arise which I have proposed to remedy by an amendment which I have suggested to the gentleman in charge of the bill, providing that there shall be no interference with State or national quarantine laws.

With that amendment adopted, I believe that objection to the bill would be obviated.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Massachusetts will allow me to make a suggestion, I will ask him to yield now to a motion to adjourn. He will have the floor when the call of committees is resumed for the further consideration of this measure.

Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts. I will accept the suggestion of the gentleman from New York.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Massachusetts has fifteen minutes of his time remaining.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 8963. An act to fix the terms of the district and circuit courts of the western judicial district in the State of Louisiana;

H. R. 10780. An act to provide for the sittings of the circuit and district courts of the southern district of Florida in the city of Ocala, in said district;

H. R. 996. An act providing for the free homesteads on the public lands for actual and bona fide settlers and reserving the public lands for that purpose; and

H. R. 9635. An act to establish light-house and fog signals in State of Washington.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 2994. An act granting an increase of pension to Fanny F. Robertson;

S. 2154. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Owens;

S. 1319. An act granting an increase of pension to Annie E. Josephs;

S. 1266. An act granting a pension to Jacob Saladin;

S. 1191. An act granting an increase of pension to Orpha W. Reynolds;

S. 1030. An act granting a pension to Catharine Harris;

S. 1031. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Kearney;

S. 1029. An act granting a pension to Henry B. Lambe;

S. 817. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia A. Taylor;

S. 2933. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Lynn;

S. 2881. An act granting a pension to Mary A. Parker;

S. 2764. An act granting an increase of pension to William Murphy;

S. 2652. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa E. Baylor;

S. 2510. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline C. Townsend.

S. 2570. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Swift;

S. 2441. An act granting a pension to Felix G. Litton;

S. 2344. An act granting a pension to Alice V. Cook;

S. 2335. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Blake;

S. 1954. An act granting a pension to Edward L. Ruby;

S. 1918. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Higgins;

S. 1909. An act granting an increase of pension to Cecelia A. Price;

S. 1578. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Campbell, alias George W. Smith;

S. 1601. An act granting an increase of pension to John Thornton;

S. 3480. An act granting a pension to John Holland;

S. 3502. An act granting a pension to Elisabeth Whisler;

S. 3508. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward F. Phelps;

S. 3797. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Streeter;

S. 1803. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Tittsworth;

S. 3215. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew F. Dinsmore;

S. 3075. An act granting an increase of pension to Marie I. Blaisdell;

S. 3033. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Wallace;

S. 3200. An act granting a pension to John P. Hinsley;

S. 3352. An act granting a pension to Sarah Kersey;

S. 3380. An act granting an increase of pension to Hamilton K. Williams;

S. 2463. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen Leddy;

S. 1603. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Kaump;

S. 3630. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob N. Smith;

S. 3748. An act granting an increase of pension to Washington Baker;

S. 3790. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Collier;

S. 3879. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Gause;

S. 4030. An act granting a pension to Helen M. Glenny;

S. 2290. An act granting a pension to James Richardson;

S. 1833. An act granting a pension to Mary B. Christopher;

S. 757. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Stockton;

S. 480. An act granting an increase of pension to Juliet Gregory;

S. 682. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilhelmina Hippler;

S. 649. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha Mad-docks;

S. 657. An act granting a pension to Matthew Redmond;

S. 477. An act granting a pension to Levi C. Faught;

S. 316. An act granting an increase of pension to Louann A. Parry;

S. 299. An act granting a pension to Susanna Marion;

S. 289. An act granting a pension to John B. Turchin;

S. 36. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma G. Sargent;

S. 135. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances C. De Russy;

S. 2650. An act granting an increase of pension to Katharine Taylor Dodge;

S. 2657. An act to reimburse sundry collectors of internal revenue for internal-revenue stamps paid for and charged in their accounts and not received by them;

S. 3206. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses King, jr.; and

S. 139. An act granting a pension to Adelaide Sessions.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bill and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 4658. An act relating to the anchorage of vessels in the Kennebec River at or near Bath, Me.—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

S. R. 122. Joint resolution respecting the unveiling of the statue of Lafayette, at Paris, France, July 4, 1900—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Senate concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War is hereby directed to appoint a board of officers of the Corps of Engineers whose duty it shall be to make careful examination and prepare a detailed estimate for the improvement of Snake River, in the States of Idaho and Washington, from the head of navigation on said river to the point of junction with the Columbia River, with a view to improving said river and making the same navigable at all seasons—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made, in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of the river and harbor act approved March 3, 1899, in Cleveland Harbor, with a view to the further improvement of said harbor: First, by such additional construction or extension as may be necessary to provide a safer and better entrance for vessels at the main entrance to the breakwater in said harbor; second, and further to provide such additional harbor room as may be found necessary by an extension eastward of the breakwater now under construction in said harbor—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made in accordance with the provisions of section 22 of the river and harbor act of March 3, 1899, in Boston Harbor, with a view of providing channels 2,000 feet wide and 35 feet deep from the navy-yard at Charlestown and the Chelsea Bridge and Charles River Bridge to President Roads and from President Roads through Broad Sound Channel to the ocean—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of War be directed to cause a survey to be made of the outlet to Flathead Lake, in the State of Montana, with a view to ascertaining the feasibility, desirability, and the probable cost of maintaining said lake at its normal height, and thus preventing the overflow of part of the upper valley—

to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

S. 3303. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to provide condemned cannon and carriages for ornamentation purposes in

the national cemetery at Knoxville, Tenn.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 3197. An act to provide for the erection of a public building in the city of Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

S. 4085. An act to correct the military record of C. R. Dickson—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 4167. An act to authorize a one-story addition to the post-office at Newark, N. J.—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that the reference of the document (No. 679) relating to guards and watchmen at the work-house in Washington, if there be no objection, will be changed from the Committee on Appropriations to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

There was no objection.

And then, on motion of Mr. PAYNE (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the House, a statement of the Commissioner-General of Immigration in relation to the immigration of Japanese, was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 121) for the appointment of first lieutenants of volunteers in the Signal Corps of the Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1495); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state the Union.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11214) to amend an act entitled "An act for the erection of a public building at Anniston, Ala.," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1499); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RAY of New York, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 138) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1501); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3419) making further provision for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1502); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10607) granting increase of pension to Nathan Disbrow, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1474); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8254) to increase the pension of Marie L. Apgar, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1475); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9555) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas Briggeman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1476); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DRIGGS, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10815) to grant a pension to Lucius K. Smalling, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1477); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8785) granting an increase of pension to Annie B. Sharrard, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1478); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7159) to increase the pension of Wesley C. Sawyer, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1479); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6947) to grant Alonzo C. Rembaugh, late private, Company C, Seventy-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers, a pension, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1480); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10618) granting an increase of pension to Martin O'Connor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1481); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7179) granting a pension to Clarence S. Hall, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1482); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 315) granting a pension to Moses H. Taber, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1483); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 539) granting an increase of pension to Fielding L. Rutherford, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1484); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11145) granting a pension to William C. Chandler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1485); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 6424) for the relief of Charles S. Devine, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1486); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8141) granting a pension to Mrs. Sarah J. Peddycoart, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1487); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3527) granting a pension to Edwin M. Farnham, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1488); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3329) granting an increase of pension to Kate B. Warren, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1489); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 5007) granting a pension to Smith Miner, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1490); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3234) granting an increase of pension to Mary Yowell, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1491); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10742) granting a pension to Wilburn W. Testerman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1492); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2651) granting a pension to Henry Hill, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1493); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7600) granting an increase of pension to Charles Claussen, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1494), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9850) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of R. L. Pritchard & Co., of Page County, Va., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1496); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 8946) to pay to J. P. Ouzts \$209.50 for services as deputy collector internal revenue for district of South Carolina, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1497); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 147) for the relief of Eunice Tripler; widow of Charles S. Tripler, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1498); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GIBSON, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3080) for the relief of Salvador Costa, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1500); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10743) granting a pension to Augusta Ullman, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1503); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. RIXEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2584) for the relief of Mary E. McDonald, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1504); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BAILEY of Kansas, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the joint resolution of the House (H. J. Res. 108) for the relief of Thomas Hoyne, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1505); which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of bills of the following titles; which were thereupon referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 11490) for the relief of Mary Fass—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 2165) granting a pension to Barbara A. Bauman—Committee on Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BREAZEALE: A bill (H. R. 11584) making an appropriation for the repair and improvement of Alexandria Harbor, Louisiana—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 11585) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Grand Junction, in the State of Colorado—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11586) to provide for the furnishing by internal-revenue collectors and deputy collectors of duplicates of receipts for special taxes—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 11587) to issue commissions to acting assistant surgeons—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. COONEY: A bill (H. R. 11588) permitting the building of a dam across the Osage River at the city of Warsaw, Benton County, Mo.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LASSITER: A bill (H. R. 11589) making an appropriation for constructing a road to the City Point National Cemetery, near Petersburg, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11590) making an appropriation for constructing a road to the Poplar Grove National Cemetery, near Petersburg, Va.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OTJEN: A bill (H. R. 11591) to amend certain provisions of an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes"—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 11593) to extend the

lines of the Washington and Marlboro Electric Railway Company—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. OTEY: A bill (H. R. 11610) for increase of force at workhouse, District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BELL: A bill (H. R. 11619) to prevent the overcrowding of street cars, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: A bill (H. R. 11592) granting a pension to Charles Bailey—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWERSOCK: A bill (H. R. 11594) to pension John F. Epler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BROMWELL: A bill (H. R. 11595) for the relief of Alice J. Hoffman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 11596) granting a pension to George B. Boyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: A bill (H. R. 11597) granting a pension to James H. Van Wagenen—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COWHERD: A bill (H. R. 11598) for the relief of Frank B. Case—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: A bill (H. R. 11599) to amend "An act to incorporate the Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias"—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FREER: A bill (H. R. 11600) for the relief of Mary A. Coleman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GILBERT: A bill (H. R. 11601) granting a pension to James L. Webb—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11602) for the relief of Samuel McClure—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLET of New York: A bill (H. R. 11603) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Dininny—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 11604) for relief of Jacob B. Phillips—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: A bill (H. R. 11605) granting a pension to John Brisban—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11606) granting a pension to Mahala Hyatt—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11607) granting a pension to Joel O. White—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LACEY: A bill (H. R. 11608) granting an increase of pension to William Sapp—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MORGAN: A bill (H. R. 11609) to make Lieut. Commander Arthur P. Osborn a commander on the retired list—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RIXEY: A bill (H. R. 11611) for the relief of heirs of James W. Stone—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11612) for relief of heirs of Lewis Shumate—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHAFROTH: A bill (H. R. 11613) granting an increase of pension to Oscar Abbott—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11614) granting an increase of pension to Henry R. Bennett—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 11615) for the relief of Curtis & Tilden—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SLAYDEN: A bill (H. R. 11616) for the relief of Katie A. Nolan—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HENRY C. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 11617) granting an increase of pension to Allen A. Kent—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 11618) granting an increase of pension to John Burns—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 11620) granting a pension to Nancy V. J. Fenell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WACHTER: A bill (H. R. 11621) for the relief of the legal representatives of Henry W. Freedley—to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of R. M. Stanley & Bro., of Columbus, Ga., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines, perfumery, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ALLEN of Maine: Petition of C. W. Allen and 7 other retail druggists of Brunswick, Me., relating to the stamp tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENNER: Petition of Benedict & Co. and 6 others, of Dayton, Ohio, for the repeal of the revenue tax on cigars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of druggists of Dayton, Ohio, for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Petition of S. Higgins and members of the Ex-Slave Mutual Relief, Bounty, and Pension Association, asking for the passage of Senate bill 1176, allowing them a pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BULL: Resolutions of the Yacht Masters and Engineers' Association of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of House bill No. 117—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of William W. Handy and 6 citizens of Providence, R. I., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURKETT: Resolutions of the faculty of the Industrial College of the University of Nebraska, in favor of the establishment of a bureau of weights and measures—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, protest of International Machinists of Omaha, Nebr., opposing the passage of the Grout oleomargarine bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CANNON: Petitions of citizens of the Twelfth Congressional District of Illinois, in favor of the passage of House bill No. 3717, amending the oleomargarine law—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CLARKE of New Hampshire: Petition of citizens of Henniker, N. H., for the passage of a bill to forbid liquor selling in canteens and in the Army, Navy, post exchanges, etc.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS (by request): Petition of A. Y. Trogdon, of Paris, Ill., for remedy in pension appeals—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOLLIVER: Paper to accompany bill to amend an act to incorporate the Supreme Lodge of the Knights of Pythias—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of John Lockwood, pharmacist, Charleston, S. C., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FINLEY: Petitions of the Cherokee Drug Company and others, of Goffney, S. C., and J. E. W. Haile, of Kershaw, S. C., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FREER: Papers to accompany House bill relating to the claim of Mary A. Coleman—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. GARDNER of New Jersey: Petition of the Broad Street Methodist Episcopal Church, of Burlington, N. J., in favor of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GROSVENOR: Petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Columbus, Ohio, against any legislation increasing the tax on oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOFFECKER: Petition of William A. Talley and others, of Pomona Grange, No. 1, of Newcastle County, Del., in favor of Senate bill No. 1439, relating to an act to regulate commerce—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of William F. Dunn and other druggists of Smyrna, Del., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Avon, N. J., to prohibit the selling of liquors in any post exchange, transport, or premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KNOX: Resolutions of convention of grocers and butchers of Massachusetts, favoring the passage of the Brosius pure-food bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Hon. J. J. Leonard and 58 citizens of Lawrence, Mass., to accompany House bill No. 9227, to remove the charge of desertion from the record of William J. Dempsey—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Charles Clark & Son, of Lawrence, Mass., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LACEY: Resolutions of the Federation of Labor No. 8004, of Oskaloosa, Iowa, favoring the retention of public lands for homestead uses—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEVY: Petition of residents and property owners in the borough of Bronx, city of New York, requesting the dredging and deepening of West Chester Creek—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. McCALL: Papers to accompany House bill No. 10679, granting a pension to Lowell M. Maxham—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McCLEARY: Petitions of Rev. J. E. Ingham and 20 citizens of Sherburn; A. Davis and 53 others, of Vernon Center;

Miss Rosena Thomas and 11 others, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Lake Crystal, and Mrs. Belle Bottomley, of the Young Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Nashville Center, Minn., to prohibit the selling of liquors in any post exchange, transport, or premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MADDOX: Papers relating to the claim of Jasper N. Hawkins, of Chattooga County, Ga.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. MIERS of Indiana: Petitions of druggists of Alfordsville, Bloomfield, Carlisle, and Washington, Ind., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 8842, granting a pension to Sarah O. Field—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany House bill No. 8843, to remove the charge of desertion now standing against Alfred Brown—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: Petitions of Lewis C. Hayes, F. A. Hall and others, E. W. Tompkins and others, of Indianapolis, Ind., for the repeal of the stamp tax on proprietary medicines—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIXEY: Paper to accompany House bill for the relief of James W. Stone, late of Stafford County, Va.—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SHATTUC: Petition of Charles Mossmyer and others, of Cincinnati, Ohio, for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany House bill No. 9368, for the relief of Rebecca P. Tyns—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SPERRY: Petition of the Retail Druggists' Association of New Haven, Conn., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SPRAGUE: Petition of Otis Clapp & Son, Boston, Mass., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and citizens of Roslindale, Mass., Baptist Church of Roxbury, Young People's Christian Union of Franklin, Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Hope Lodge, of Bellingham, and citizens of Spencer, Mass., urging the passage of the Bowersock bill preventing the sale of liquor upon premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STARK: Petition of M. E. Shultz, R. McMaster, H. Kleinhaus, and 7 others, of Beatrice, Nebr., for the repeal of the tax on medicines, perfumery, and cosmetics—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Petition of R. E. Dietz Company, of New York, favoring the Federal ownership of Government lands and the building of storage reservoirs by the Government—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. UNDERWOOD: Petition of G. B. Forbes and others, of Birmingham, Ala., for the repeal of the stamp tax on medicines, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of A. H. Snyder and other farmers of Montgomery County, Pa., in favor of the Grout bill taxing oleomargarine—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petitions of Graham Post and M. E. Richards Post, of Pottstown, Pa.; Owen Jones Post and Lower Merion Baptist Church, of Bryn Mawr, Pa., for the passage of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Petition of J. G. Brill Post, No. 594, Department of Illinois, Grand Army of the Republic, in favor of the new pension bill—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, evidence to accompany House bill granting a pension to Nancy V. J. Ferrell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WRIGHT: Petition of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Hawley, Pa., for the passage of the Bowersock anti-canteen bill—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. YOUNG: Petition of Gethsemane Methodist Episcopal Church, of Philadelphia, Pa., to prohibit the selling of liquors in any post exchange, transport, or premises used for military purposes—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolutions of the Grocers and Importers' Exchange of Philadelphia, Pa., indorsing House bill No. 10374, increasing the postage on certain publications and favoring 1-cent local letter postage—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Master Builders' Exchange of Philadelphia, in relation to the passage of the Loud bill—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, letters of Governor William A. Stone, of Pennsylvania, mayor of Philadelphia, and members of the board of trustees of the Philadelphia Commercial Museum, relating to the passage of House bill No. 887, in the interest of manufacturing and commercial industries—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.